

The Nation

Vol. XXI, No. 5.]
Registered as a Newspaper.

SATURDAY, MAY 5, 1917.

[PRICE 6D.
Postage: U.K. 3d.; Abroad 1d.]

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
EVENTS OF THE WEEK ...	105	The German Terms of Peace. By Noel Buxton, M.P. ...	118
POLITICS AND AFFAIRS:—		The Ban on THE NATION. By Harold Begbie ...	118
The Deadly Peril of Pre- ference ...	108	What the Soldiers Think. By Officer's Mother, Cap- tain and Adjutant, Royal Flying Corps, and Chap- lain ...	118
The Deciding Factor... ..	109		
The Repeal of Habeas Corpus ...	110	POETRY:—	
"THE HIDDEN HAND" AGAIN	110	Song of Redemption. By Edith Anne Stewart ...	118
A LONDON DIARY. By A Wayfarer ...	111	THE WORLD OF BOOKS. By Penguin ...	119
LIFE AND LETTERS:—		REVIEWS:—	
The Moral of May Day ...	113	An Indian Tale... ..	120
"An Eye for an Eye" ...	114	A Forerunner of the New Biology. By Julian Huxley	122
PRESENT-DAY PROBLEMS:—		Carving up Turkey ...	124
Developing the Empire ...	115	A Lot ...	126
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR:—		THE WEEK IN THE CITY. By Lucellum ...	126
Reprisals. By the Right Hon. Sir Edward Fry ...	117		
"Lord of the Sabbath." By the Rev. Dr. Robert F. Horton ...	117		

[The Editor will be pleased to consider manuscripts if accom-
panied by stamped and addressed envelopes. He accepts no
responsibility, however, for manuscripts submitted to him.]

Events of the Week.

THE offensive in the West was resumed on a comparatively restrained note in the early part of the week. Measured against the attacks of April 9th and 16th, with their instantaneous harvest of men and material, the opening movements seem small and merely of local importance. This, however, is far from being the case. The attacks north of the Scarpe and west of the Moronvillers positions secured advantages which have a strategic bearing. Each of them is designed to prepare the way for wide developments—the one towards Douai, and the other towards the eastern waters of the Aisne. General Maude is still following up the Turks, and his success has an important, though not immediately obvious, bearing on the war. But the most important area of actual fighting is the sea, and here we are unable to assess the results except in the most general way. The Ramsgate raid at the end of last week was clearly a further attempt to disturb our naval dispositions, and this is a reminder that these are made with sufficient skill to prevent any larger enterprise of the German navy. But it is well to realize that the continuance of the offensive, and even of our resistance, depends upon the submarine campaign.

On Saturday Sir Douglas Haig made another thrust between the Vimy-Acheville road and the Scarpe. The extent of the attacking front was six miles, and the objective was the capture of the original fourth defensive system, the "Oppy line." The fortified village of Arleux was taken by the Canadians, and the front trenches between Oppy and Mericourt were also secured. As a result of the two days' fighting there remained almost

1,000 prisoners in our hands. The total captures for April amount to 19,343 officers and men, 257 guns, 227 trench mortars, and 470 machine guns. These figures, compared with the battles in which we have been engaged before this war, give the measure of the change in modern warfare. The positions captured represent another of the lines upon which Hindenburg hoped to arrest our advance. For it is obvious that we are advancing far too rapidly, and German *moral* will not survive much longer unless the retreat can be carried out more deliberately. But to purchase *moral* with men is a paradox.

* * *

ANOTHER great battle opened on Thursday morning between the Vimy-Acheville road and the Sensée river. The front of attack measured twelve miles, and the British again found themselves met by the stubborn resistance which has characterized the German defence since the great breakdown on Easter Monday. The objective was the Drocourt-Quéant line, which lay some two miles east of the initial positions. Headway was made most noticeably on the wings. On the northern or left wing, Fresnoy, four miles east of Vimy, was taken, and the German line was penetrated west of Quéant. Both successes were maintained against all counter-attacks. But Cherizy seems to have been won only to be lost again. More important than the actual tactical gains are the losses inflicted upon the enemy. Troops assembling to counter-attack were caught by the artillery, and, when assaulting, suffered heavy loss from barrage and machine-gun fire. Several hundreds of prisoners were taken, and the action is still in progress.

* * *

THE French advance is a more obvious and impressive success, though the frequent and prolonged counter-attacks show little discrimination between the two. With Moronvillers our Ally secured observation right up to the eastern curve of the Aisne and westward towards Craonne. The most sensitive sector included in this sweep of country is the ground about Reims, and this not for any strategic reason, but simply because the Germans, with utter brutality, are ruining the beautiful cathedral. On Tuesday afternoon the French suddenly attacked down the northern slopes of Mount Cornillet, and advanced for a distance of between half and three-quarters of a mile. They secured 520 prisoners, and have resisted the violent attempts to dislodge them. The chief advantage of the gain is to accentuate more sharply the salient which is being developed about Reims. But the city is not yet delivered, and it may be some time before it can be made immune. It is doubtful if the Cathedral can be saved from the deliberate effort to destroy one of the most beautiful and important public buildings in the world, and to give governing Germany the character which her own Harden fastens upon her—an "abomination in the eyes of the world." Here, again, it is obvious that German soldiers are paying for their leaders' vandalism, whose only motive can be to depreciate the *moral* of the French. The actual effect is just the opposite.

REPORTS from Mesopotamia give a most encouraging account of the progress of our offensive, but suggest an unsatisfactory state of things on part of the Russian front. General Baratoff is in Petrograd, when his co-operation is most needed on the Persian frontier; and apparently the Russians have evacuated Mush. There is no reason to think that this will affect the main position in Armenia. But it should not have been allowed when the British are advancing, and need security on their right flank. General Maude is still master of the situation in his neighborhood. The 13th Turkish Corps, which had at least twice tried to help the 18th Corps beyond Samarra, was driven up the Shatt-el-Adhaim towards the Jebel Hamrin hills. It was caught at the ravine through which the stream flows, and driven into the hills with heavy loss. The 18th Corps is at present fifteen miles north of Samarra, where it will be dealt with in due course.

* * *

MR. LLOYD GEORGE made a statement at Guildhall which appears to reflect his idea of candor in officialism. Referring to the submarine campaign, he said: "We are very much alarmed with the figures that appear every morning. *But we publish them all because we want the public to know. We are concealing nothing.*" Is not the tonnage of the ships sunk "concealed"? Is there any announcement of the number of Allied or neutral vessels sunk, though the number of arrivals and clearances of all these vessels is given? Really the records as they stand can be used for any purpose—to stimulate panic, to allay misgiving, or to give encouragement. Take, for instance, the number of British vessels attacked in the weeks beginning February 24th. They are 43, 40, 31, 77, 57, 54, 39, 52, 91, 75. What can one make of a series of that character? The worst week represents three times the number of attempts made in the best week, and there is no obvious periodicity to be deduced from the list. The total British sinkings make a similarly arbitrary list: 27, 25, 19, 57, 45, 34, 26, 39, 64, and 53. The number of freight vessels (or vessels other than fishing craft) do indeed give some general idea of how our mercantile fleet is being weakened. They are 21, 23, 16, 26, 27, 31, 19, 28, 54, and 47.

* * *

BUT such lists supply no just measure of the real problem of the present state of our transport. There is, indeed, a great deal too much concealment about the Navy. We hear of the firing of a torpedo by a German seaplane. It is quite probable that British seaplanes are even more versatile. But we do not hear of it until the report of the Germans' achievement compels the Admiralty to announce that the first successful use of seaplanes as torpedo craft was made by the British in the sea of Marmora. A number of Turkish vessels were sunk in that way in August, 1915. All that is spontaneously reported of the British Navy is that numerous raids are made upon the coast and that the submarines are able to inflict heavy loss upon our merchant fleet. The Admiralty is still the seat of obscurantism. Is it too much to hope that even now Sir Edward Carson will realize the truth of his leader's assurance that concealment "is a mistake"?

* * *

WEDNESDAY'S Budget speech was devoid of sensational matter, in spite of the immense figures in which it revelled. No new taxes are introduced, and only three increases in existing taxes—a higher scale of the entertainment tax, to yield an estimated increase of

1½ millions, an additional 1s. 10d. per lb. on tobacco, and a rise of the excess profits' tax from 60 to 80 per cent. This last increase is estimated to yield 20 millions. Mr. Law announced a new policy for dealing with shipping profits. He distinguished the shipping from other war-profit-earning trades on the ground that it wielded a monopoly, and could recoup itself for high taxation by raising freights—an economic argument of very dubious validity. Practically the whole of shipping is to be brought under Government control by the process of requisitioning, which will of itself reduce freights and profits.

* * *

THE estimated expenditure for this year is £2,290,000,000, of which it is expected that £638,600,000 will be provided out of taxation (an increase of 65 millions on last year's yield), the deficit of 1,651 millions to be provided out of new loans. Having regard to the continued rise of prices, the enlargement of our fighting forces and munitions, and the necessities of our European Allies, the estimate of expenditure is sanguine. Even if the war should end this summer or autumn, we could hardly expect any reduction in the rate of expenditure during the current year. The cost of demobilization must swallow up all the reductions in war destructiveness. Last year's estimate was very largely exceeded for the reasons we have named, and it seems unlikely that the borrowing for this year will be much below 2,000 millions, though America may help us to bear the burden under which we are staggering. Mr. Law estimates that 26 per cent. of the national expenditure of the war period has been defrayed out of taxes. But the proportion of war-expenditure defrayed out of war-taxation is, of course, much smaller, amounting to some 15 per cent. Though this is better than any other belligerent country is doing, it is not good enough.

* * *

THE novel feature in Mr. Law's speech was his forecast of the financial position of the country "at the end of this year on a peace basis." The size of the imponderables makes any close calculation impossible. But beginning, as he thinks likely, with a narrow surplus of two millions, he looks forward to expansions of revenue from various sources after the war, especially from reviving Customs and Excise, and from the portions of income-tax whose collection will have been postponed by the provisions against deduction at the source, for reasons of the War Loan. Large arrears of excess profits will also be thrown over into next year. The loss of further excess profits' tax after the war would also be partially offset by the fact that excess profits would not escape scot free, being then subjected to the income-tax of 5s. in the £, which, of course, must continue to be imposed for many years to come. The situation, even if the war is well ended before next spring, will be no bed of roses for the taxpayer. The debt charge alone for next year is put at the figure of 211 millions, and is likely to be much more when this year's borrowing is added in. There must also be an enormous sum for pensions, and for the large capital expenditure which will be certainly wanted for restoring industries, housing, education, and other essential needs of civil reconstruction.

* * *

THE Imperial War Conference has published, through the Colonial Secretary, some of its conclusions, which are stated to have been unanimous. A few of them will doubtless receive the same measure of national assent. No one will question the wisdom of postponing the settlement of an Imperial Constitution till after the war. And most parties will agree that the Dominions should be recognized as "autonomous nations," that

India is "an important portion" of the Imperial Commonwealth (Is this a recognition or a denial of the right of self-government?), and that both the Dominions and India should have a voice in foreign policy. It is also proper to tabulate and organize the metal and mineral resources of the Empire, and to develop its production of munitions. The capital division of policy occurs in the declaration of a Protectionist Empire, based on "favorable treatment" of Imperial "produce and manufactures." There is here, be it observed, no exception of food, though Mr. Law's meaningless phrase, "with due regard to the interests of our Allies," reappears. This abandonment of Free Trade, and of the open door which has let the world's trade into our "free, tolerant, unaggressive Empire," will be resisted, we hope, by the finally united forces of Liberalism and Labor.

* * *

For the first time during this war the celebration of the Socialist May Day Festival has been an important event, which means a partial return to the ideals of the International. In Russia it was, of course, a festival of rejoicing; but the people which congratulated itself on its own liberty also loses no occasion of demanding a general peace without conquests. In all the resolutions of the Petrograd and Moscow Workmen's Councils stress is laid on the word "general," but the determination is also expressed to insist that the Provisional Government shall not protract the war for annexations. Of the celebrations in Germany we know little, and it is significant that the export of all German newspapers has been stopped or delayed. The munition workers are now under direct military discipline, and may have been unable to do much. There was, however, a partial strike, even in Berlin. Some very significant details about the recent April strikes may be gleaned from the Swiss Press. At the Kiel Dockyards the strikers were replaced by soldiers, who refused to work so soon as they realized that they were being used for strike-breaking. At Magdeburg, and some other places, the troops refused to fire on the strikers. The young recruits in training, aged fourteen to nineteen, were then called out, and these boys were successfully driven to do what the older soldiers had refused.

* * *

Rumor declares that the position of the German Chancellor is again in danger. He has displeased the Junkers by his visible inclination to the Left, but he does not satisfy the Left, since he delays the work of internal reform. The chief anger of the Junkers is, however, reserved for Austria. Here May Day was openly and universally celebrated, as a national demonstration in favor of peace. Count Reventlow is contemptuous, after his manner, about this "outstretched hand" which Austria has extended to the enemy. Between the lines one reads the fear—probably a well-founded fear—that Austria is wavering over the continued prosecution of the war. In the meanwhile, however, there are no signs of an immediate change. Count Tisza, a good deal shaken no doubt, has been invited to take back his resignation and to continue the direction of Hungarian affairs. What will happen when the Reichsrath meets this month is very doubtful. It is a mistake to suppose that the intrigue against Parliamentary Government came only from the German Party of Ascendancy. The Poles, who still insist that Galician Autonomy shall be conceded before Parliament meets, by an extra-constitutional edict, are playing a very egoistic game. They prefer to secure their own position, instead of helping the Czechs to secure a general measure of federal Home Rule.

* * *

On Thursday Mr. Asquith made to the Eighty Club a dignified and indirect reply to Mr. George's implied indictment of his Ministry's neglect to grow and store food during the years of war. He stated that Mr. Runciman had cornered the Australian wheat supply, and brought into the country £50,000,000 worth of

frozen meat, and that Lord Selborne had stored large quantities of wheat. But he hardly met the real and grave indictment of Admiralty administration (which the Censorship has just forbidden Mr. Pollen to criticize). This is the loss of initiative; the want of a vigorous offensive, coupled with Mr. Balfour's lethargic and unimaginative dealing with the always brooding menace of the submarine. This, as we have insisted over and over again, has turned out to be the capital defect of our scheme of war. Food economy is a mere palliative; rather, it is the admission of the partial failure of the great protective arm of these islands.

* * *

GEORGE V. has issued a Proclamation, after the style of George III., "exhorting and charging" the men and women of the Realm to be frugal, to think of others, to cut down their bread-eating by at least a fourth, to employ substitutes for flour, and not to use it in pastry, and not to give oats to their horses without a licence. This is proper and dignified counsel, and we hope it will be seriously weighed. Failing that, there is to be compulsory rationing, to begin in July, when the period of shortage will have well begun. But voluntary abstention will, we think, save the situation, which, as Lord Curzon hinted, has been worsened by our nervous scribes and statesmen.

* * *

THE singular case of M. Lenin deserves attention in England. This able but fanatical revolutionary is the leader of what used to be called the Majority fraction of the Russian Social Democratic Party (the split is of long standing, and the less extreme "Minority" is to-day the leading group). After the revolution, he and some thirty other Socialist exiles in Switzerland, who describe themselves as anti-Imperialists, were refused permission to return to Russia by the British and French Governments, which, of course, control the sea-routes. The Swiss Socialist Party intervened, and its secretary obtained from Germany permission for these exiles to return over the German railways *via* Denmark. The *quid pro quo* was to be the release of German civilians interned in Russia. We do not know the character of Lenin's dealings with the German authorities, but it is fair to say that a group of Socialists of all nations in Switzerland issued a public manifesto to cover him from the charge of treasonable relations with them. The party travelled through Germany, under a Swiss conductor, in a closed carriage with sealed windows. Lenin is commonly described in our papers as a "pacifist" who is advocating a separate peace. He has been disavowed by the Council of Workmen and Soldiers, but Mr. Farbman explains in the "Manchester Guardian" that he is preaching the continued prosecution of the war, "with the purpose of extending the social revolution throughout the whole of Europe." We need not repudiate sympathy with aims so wild as this, but the policy of imposing continued exile on Russian Socialists of whom our Government disapproves, is not likely to improve our very delicate relations with the Russian proletariat.

* * *

We have received the following cablegram from the Editor of "The New Republic":—

"The news that THE NATION has been excluded from foreign mails has been received in the United States with genuine and widespread concern, and is the topic of surprised and indignant comment among the educated public.

"Everywhere THE NATION was read, especially by makers of opinion throughout the United States. Its interpretation of England and the aims of the Allies has been steadily valuable to the Wilson Administration, while its informed comment on American affairs, especially during the past year, has been of immense service to the President and those supporting his endeavors to end American isolation and bring the United States into line. Of the comments made on this exclusion, those by the New York 'Evening Post' and the 'New Republic' may be considered representative of the country's attitude."

Politics and Affairs.

THE DEADLY PERIL OF PREFERENCE.

It must be difficult for our Protectionists, who are seeking to make hay of our commercial fortunes while the sky is dark, to assess with any confidence the value of the preferential pledges drawn last week from the Prime Minister and Mr. Law. The "principle" of Preference for each part of the Empire is accepted by the Imperial War Cabinet (in the absence of Australia) in respect of "the produce and manufactures" of the various parts of the Empire. There are, however, to be no burdens upon foods, and the scheme is not to be made operative until after the war. So much from Mr. Law. In his brief reference to the subject, Mr. George lays so much stress upon improvements of communications as to suggest that his purpose might be to proceed more by way of subsidies on shipping and financial development than by tariffs. It will be remembered that ten years ago Mr. George took up with some energy the project of the All-Red Route, supported by imperial subsidies, and doles of money are more consonant with his ideas of management than taxes. At the same time, it is evident that the Protectionists, though not pleased with the postponement of their policy, consider that a substantial advance has been made in the direction of a general tariff. It is difficult to understand the source of their satisfaction. The conclusion to which Mr. Joseph Chamberlain was driven fourteen years ago, that in order to give a Preference to the Colonies, you must tax food, is as vital to-day as it was then. Exclude food taxes and you not only diminish very greatly the value of your preference, so far as the exporting dominions and dependencies are concerned, but you distribute most unequally the advantages of the policy to them. For, food excluded, the gist of the proposal is the taxation of raw materials from all parts of the world, with a lower tariff for the Empire. When Mr. Law speaks of manufactures as a subject for preference, he doubtless contemplates a discriminating tariff for our Crown Colonies and Protectorates in favor of British exports, substituting manufactures from the Mother-country for foreign manufactures.

But neither he, nor the other members of the War Cabinet and of the Imperial Conference who have now pledged themselves to this scheme, can have thought out clearly the two fatal implications. The first is economic. At a time when our national industry and commerce will be struggling to stand on their peace legs, and to adjust themselves to the many changes in the currents of trade which war conditions will have brought about, it is proposed to hamper our manufactures by a tariff upon the raw materials and semi-manufactured goods which they require. Lancashire, already suffering from the stab inflicted on her Indian trade, is to be taxed upon her foreign cotton imports, about three-quarters of her whole supply, in order to give a preference to Egypt. Our wool supply is already mainly Imperial, but contributions from Argentina, France, and Chili are to be discouraged. Our supplies of silk and flax, almost wholly foreign, are to be taxed in order to encourage the meagre contributions from India and Hong Kong. British possessions only yielded in 1913 about 16 per cent. of our imported timber, drawn from a great variety of friendly countries. The building trades, hampered by "dear money," will find their chief materials made artificially dearer when the need for activity is most urgent. Similarly, we might take one after another of our important manufactures to

illustrate the wantonness of this policy. The whole notion which underlies it is fundamentally unsound. By no sort of tariff tricks is it possible, even were it otherwise desirable, to make our Empire even approximate to economic self-sufficiency. We can and ought to develop its resources. But we cannot get from it, vast though it is, the main part of our materials. In 1913, the last normal year, the value of our foreign imports of materials was 190 millions, as compared with 91 millions from our Empire. Many of our essential supplies of important metals, such as iron and zinc, manganese ore, platinum, antimony, white lead, are entirely or mainly drawn from foreign sources. The same is true of mineral oils—nitrates, phosphate of lime, and other fertilizers. It may, perhaps, be said that, if no considerable competing supplies are available from the Empire, we shall not put on a tax so as to give a preference. And, indeed, reflection makes it obvious that an Empire self-sufficing in all essential supplies is a dream.

But it must be borne in mind that any substantial reversal of our Free Trade policy, whether or not accompanied by Preference, will jeopardize our free, full access to the natural resources of the world. Here political considerations are interwoven with commercial. Nations whose produce has hitherto enjoyed free markets in this country and its dependencies, will naturally resent the new barriers of preferential tariffs. This will apply not only to neutral nations, but to our Allies. Belgium, in her struggles towards recovery, would find herself subjected to new taxes upon her glass and linen imports to Great Britain. We should reward the heroism of France by clapping duties on the dress, jewellery, and other luxuries she sends us. Russia, through her leading statesmen and journals, has protested in advance against a discrimination which will put her goods at a disadvantage with those from our Empire. Mr. Law seemed, indeed, to have some inkling of these dangers and difficulties when he justified his announcement of Preference by the words, "having regard to the interests of the Allies." But the notion that an inherent difficulty can be got rid of by a qualifying phrase is peculiar to statesmen. How do our "Liberal" and Tory Protectionists, Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Law, propose to satisfy the interests of the Allies while discriminating in favor of the Empire? Will they admit into our markets, not merely goods, but raw materials from the United States on equal terms with those from Canada? If not, do they expect that the exporting interests of America will sit down quietly under a discrimination on the part of their war-Ally?

That Mr. George, who has betrayed so many Liberal principles, should have betrayed one more can be no matter for surprise to those who know him. But most of the principles betrayed have had an exclusively national bearing. They have involved losses of our internal liberties of speech, writing, employment, travel, justice, and the like. But the tampering with Free Trade imperils our relations with other peoples. The announcement of such an intention as Mr. George has made, not merely damages our future relations with our Allies and with the neutral countries upon which we must, under all circumstances, continue to be dependent for some of our vital supplies. It is a direct repudiation of the policy of free and pacific internationalism, formally proposed by Mr. Wilson as the basis of world security, and formally accepted by the Allied Governments. The proposal of a League of Nations affords the only possible provision for a pacific future. But a League of Nations is admittedly impracticable unless equality of commercial

opportunities exists among its members. For the British Empire, containing one-quarter of the population of the earth, to signalize the conclusion of peace by closing its free market to all foreigners who had hitherto had access to them, and by dividing foreigners into allies, neutrals, enemies, is to wreck at the outset the main hope for saving the civilization of the world. Let Free Traders not deceive themselves by the pretence that all this talk of tariffs and preferences is bluff. The business interests that want Protection in this country know what they are doing. They do not desire pacific internationalism in the future. Mr. George, whether he knows it or not, is fumbling in his characteristic fashion towards the policy of a close national and Imperial State, Protectionist, Imperialist, Militarist, Bureaucratic, with bribes and doles to keep labor quiet and submissive. This Prussian-Australianism fits his temper and the occasion. The economic and political interests with which he has now identified himself demand this close State. The business, as the political, world is for them a struggle for power, privilege, and profit. They see in Protectionism the gain they want, and the Imperial sentiment is dear to them, not so much for the bond of unity it weaves with the diverse races that comprise the Empire, as for the opportunity it furnishes for cherishing and practising their policy against competing nations and traders. The damage done to our trade prospects by the threatened withdrawal of our free markets, considerable though it be, is of smaller significance than the blow it strikes at the possibility that this war may really be "the war to end war." Preference within the Empire means a general tariff, and a general tariff means commercial war, competing alliances, reviving armaments, and another war.

THE DECIDING FACTOR.

So many and so various are the factors which go to make up the complexity of modern war that it is natural we should waver in our judgment as to which is the most essential. At one time or another, munitions, a particular sort of munitions, money, or food have been acclaimed as the determinant of victory. Without a doubt, each of these plays its part in the resolution of the problem. But neither one, nor all combined, make an army, much less a victorious army. The selection of "numbers" as the essential factor comes nearer the truth, since it includes, though it does not define, the most important ingredients of victory. Successes have been won in this war, the greatest successes, against superior numbers and munitionment. Yet "numbers" includes the deciding factor, for "numbers" means bodies of men, and it is men who finally win battles and campaigns. It is men, kindled by a certain spiritual uplifting which we call *moral*, who defy all handicaps. Napoleon, with a sure instinct, singled out *moral* as the deciding factor of war, and we need not go back to the Revolutionary wars to see the justification of his choice. All through the present war we observe the triumph of the same quality, whether we call it confidence, will to victory, or *moral*.

The present situation seems to centre so completely in the massive offensive in the West, and the stealthy undermining of the Allied position by the submarine campaign, that it is necessary to take the just value of each operation. In a sense, we are the spectators of the most momentous and paradoxical race in the history of the world. The greatest military power of history is attempting to stave off defeat on land before defeating the greatest naval power on the sea. That is the gist of the situation. Or we may represent it to ourselves as the reverse of the Battle of the Marne—Germany attempting to turn our left flank, and we, following sound military theory, attempting to pierce the enemy's centre. It is a sort of race, and we are running a dead-heat till one or the other drops behind and acknowledges

defeat. There are not two victories. There is only one, and if we could secure a true decision in the field the struggle would be over just as much as if Germany starved us into submission to her terms.

It is when we come to this point that we reach the heart of the question. For it is not the sea, not munitions, not the justice of our cause, that has warded off defeat; but simply our will, our determination not to give in before an end was reached. There would never have been a war but for this, and if it had not been for this, we could have had peace at any time during the last year. On the other hand, our soldiers have proved that all the normal "necessities" which we allow to dominate everyday existence cannot cheat us of success if our spirit remains firm to the true objects of the war. Some of the Colonial campaigns were won simply, one might say, through starvation, fatigue, and suffering. In German South-West Africa the troops marched long distances on a half, a quarter, even an eighth ration, and a scanty water supply. It is improbable that conditions in this country will ever approximate to those on the march in Africa. But it is clear that there is a time of hardship in store. We have come down to the bare essentials of war. The same attrition which has sapped the resources of all the world is now wearing away the spirit of the belligerents, and we have a far surer index of the state of the war by examining the *moral* of both sides than any other factor.

No one who has seen the British armies has any doubt about their spirit. "It is magnificent," says General Smuts, "in its confidence and determination." Indeed, for many months now we have been made more and more aware of the contrast between the British and German troops. No one has yet seen British soldiers running forward towards the German lines calling for quarter. Never since the first days of the war have great numbers of British soldiers been taken prisoners. They do not surrender easily as do the enemy when under stress of bombardment. This signal we might exaggerate if there were no other tokens that German *moral* is wearing thinner. Recently there has been plenty of evidence of this condition. The German retreat was clearly a move to evade the British attack. Yet now we find the enemy not only standing, but counter-attacking when we have had time to consolidate ourselves. The counter-attacks might serve some military purpose if they were delivered immediately after the assault. The attackers would then be disorganized and without the support of their guns, and success might be snatched from them. What can be the purpose of waiting a day or two before counter-attacking? In the meantime the British have consolidated their positions, and brought up and ranged their guns. As a consequence, the enemy suffer heavy loss, and do not reverse the award of the battle. The only explanation of so apparently pointless a proceeding is that a counter-attack now requires careful nursing, and is justified, although it fails to recover ground. The German Staff must arrest the rate of advance at all costs, although it would be more to their advantage to retire and save their troops, a fact which their first retreat acknowledged.

And this is not all. The German *communiqués*, which began in the middle of the Somme battle to be cleverly fictitious, have now become *pièces justificatives*. In the Battle of the Somme they began to report the defeat of attacks which had not taken place in order that the tangible reverses might be minimized. But the *communiqué* of April 23rd not only does this, it imputes to us an objective we did not have, speaks of the "heroism" of the German troops three times, refers to the captured position as "the field of death before our lines," and insists on the "complete confidence" with which the Army will face new battles. Such a document can only have one meaning. It must indicate that the *moral* of the armies as well as of the civilians is declining, and has to be stimulated. It was certain to come to this sooner or later. As the last stages of the war approach, it is this deciding factor that will be at issue. For our own part, there is no need to doubt that the spirit of our armies will wax as that of the enemy wanes. We are more likely to see a purely selfish loss of civilian *moral* appearing as the result of the panicky tone of the Press,

and the repining at physical privation, which in any case will be less severe than what Germany has borne for two years. The end of the war cannot, in our view, come by physical conditions alone; force is not the only solvent of its problems, which are moral as well as material. It should come when our true object—that of security—has been attained. But it should certainly not come through a mere failure of civilian nerves any more than through lack of intellectual resource in our organizers. Determination, endurance, grit, are not substitutes for the failure of the Admiralty to grip the problem of the submarines. As a matter of fact, they never need have been called in had our sea policy been more thoughtful. But if we are prudent and steady, there are many indications that we shall defeat the militarism that has laid Europe waste.

THE REPEAL OF HABEAS CORPUS.

"Under this [Regulation 14B, enabling the Secretary of State to intern any British subject of 'hostile origin or associations' without trial and without charge], the Government becomes a Committee of Public Safety. But its powers as such are far more arbitrary than those of the most famous Committee of Safety known to history. . . . The analogy was with a practice more silent, more sinister—with the *lettres de cachet* of Louis Quatorze."

"Whoever administers it, this power of selection of a class, and power of selection within a class, is a negation of public safety or defence. It is poison to the Commonwealth."

"If a British citizen be seized under such a fiat, it is not because he has offended against a Regulation—not at all. He has therefore no rights to be informed of any charge against him. Charge against him there is none. Trial—he cannot choose its form; his rights are gone without trial. A 'regulation' has gone forth against him. He has been 'regulated' out of his liberty."

"I do not think it any mistake to suggest that, in substance it repeals the Habeas Corpus Acts, the 31st of Charles II., or the 100th of George III."

"In my view, Parliament never sanctioned, either in intention or by reason of the statutory words employed in the Defence of the Realm Acts, such a violent exercise of arbitrary power."—Lord Shaw, in the appeal in the House of Lords on the *Zadig* case.

At length a British judge has been found bold enough to recall the country to the principles of its Constitution, and inform it that Law cannot trample on Liberty without destroying itself. The House of Lords has, indeed, found by a majority that a British subject can be confined for a period only limited by the duration of the war, without a charge being made against him merely because he shares with Lord Milner the disadvantage of "hostile origin or associations," and that Parliament, under an Act prescribing certain definite offences against the national security, and providing the offenders with the right of trial, meant also to give the Crown the power of shutting up a selected class of subjects, or a selection from this selected class, without alleging any offence and without attempting to try them for it. But we think that the people of this country will pay more attention to Lord Shaw's insistence that they have a Constitution than to the Lord Chancellor's finding that they have not. "From the era of King John's Charter," says Hallam, "it must have been a clear principle of our Constitution that no man can be detained in prison without trial." Under this Regulation 14B many men have been so detained. As Lord Shaw argues, there is no reason why, if it is valid, they should not have been shot, and why the Government should not extirpate by mere seclusion in prisons and places of detention the professors of any creed—Pacifism, Socialism, Internationalism—which they desire to ban. According to the Lord Chancellor, they would not be inflicting punishment on such prisoners: they would merely be exercising a "precautionary" power. In other words, these men are shut up not for committing a crime, but because somebody in a Government office thinks that they may commit one. We would suggest that the deprivation of

liberty is the essence of punishment; and that if civil freedom can subsist side by side with the right of detention without trial, it must be in some other clime than ours. According to an Attorney-General who a few months ago proposed to take part in a rebellion against the Crown, the power of this regulation springs from the Royal Prerogative. We do not know whether even a lawyer's lips have uttered a more unconstitutional phrase since the days of James II., when the power to set up Prerogative against Parliament was settled, let us hope, for ever.

This modest claim was not, indeed, endorsed by the House of Lords, which sought to cover an act of arbitrary power with the authority of Parliament. But we do not know that this greatly betters the case. The House of Lords has presumed, as Lord Shaw says, that for the duration of the war Parliament has allowed the Executive to do anything it likes. It can "regulate" a man out of his freedom, confounding the innocent with the guilty, or, rather, declining the attempt to discriminate between the two categories. Nothing that a man *does* has any concern for the makers of Regulation 14B. They are only troubled about what he *is*—or, rather, about what his father or his mother *was*. This fact having been ascertained, his person can, in Lord Shaw's words, be "seized and detained for something entirely apart from any crime or offence, or from anything he has said or done or attempted." So far as the wording of the series of Defence of the Realm Acts goes, Parliament gave no sign that it desired to make the "foreign origin" of a British subject the presumption of an offence against the nation, entitling it to exclude him from the protection of its general system and principles of law. On the contrary, by declaring a number of acts—such as communicating with the enemy, interfering with transport, or spreading reports likely to cause disaffection or alarm—which endangered the safety of the Realm, to be proper subjects for "regulation," and attaching due trial and punishment to them, either by civil or by military courts, it may be held to have affirmed that its general purpose and procedure were based upon law, and not on any abstract *droit administratif*. It proscribed no class, or members of a class. Least of all did it exhibit its intention to repeal Habeas Corpus, and do away with the Bill of Rights. The worst, we suppose, that can be said of it is that it disestablished the British Constitution without meaning it. But it seems safer, as well as more charitable, to assume a mood of less comprehensive carelessness.

It seems to us, therefore, that THE NATION, in enabling *Zadig* to recall the existence of Magna Charta to the attention of the British people, has done its part, and that Parliament may now be invited to say what it did mean, and whether it accepts or rejects Lord Shaw's tremendous indictment of Regulation 14B. We know nothing of what the Crown has against *Zadig*. Neither, it seems, does he. Neither does any judge or jury called to try him in harmony with the law and custom of the Constitution. It is now time, after eighteen months of confinement, to give him and other victims of our *lettres de cachet* the chance of proving by process of law whether their loyalty, and that of British-born persons subject to this regulation, is more or less staunch than Lord Milner's.

"THE HIDDEN HAND" AGAIN.

THERE are many aspects of the conspiracy to suppress the foreign circulation of THE NATION which have to be considered, not the least the disloyal attempt to fasten on Sir Douglas Haig the authorship of a letter which he never wrote, and to transfer to soldiers in France the responsibility for proceedings which were initiated and led up to in this country.

We must, for example, inquire whether if THE NATION committed any offence, it was necessary to rest the case against it on a series of false statements of fact, to which the Prime Minister and Mr. Macpherson have especially contributed. We proceed to tabulate these

statements, all of which have been withdrawn, or proved to be without foundation.

1. That the letter drawing attention to the article in *THE NATION* was written by Sir Douglas Haig.—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*) Withdrawn.

2. That the letter from Headquarters in France asked that the overseas sale of *THE NATION* should be prohibited.—(*Mr. Macpherson.*) Withdrawn and contradicted by Lord Derby.

3. That the article contained a reflection on the conduct of our soldiers, instead of a criticism of a single point in the general direction of our strategy.—(*The Prime Minister.*)

4. That "articles written by some of the directors of *THE NATION* have actually been picked up in the German trenches."—(*The Prime Minister.*) This falsehood was later on changed by Mr. Macpherson into a statement reducing "some directors" to Mr. Ponsonby, who, says Mr. Macpherson, "was associated with the direction of the trust fund for subsidizing *THE NATION* and other papers," and to the admission that the article referred to was not published in *THE NATION*, but in the "New York Times."

We have only to add that Mr. Macpherson's statements as to Mr. Ponsonby's connection with *THE NATION* are a pure fabrication, and to express our surprise that he sought to defend them in the same breath in which he admitted the original offence. Mr. Ponsonby was never associated with the direction of *THE NATION* in any capacity, and is not to-day; and since the war began he has contributed to it one article, a review of a book on a subject unconnected with the war.

Finally, the so-called *NATION* article was a leaflet, passed by the Censor, which we never saw or heard of till Mr. Ponsonby sent us a copy of it on Wednesday last.

In other words, the overseas circulation of *THE NATION* has been prohibited because, among other reasons (some of which are admittedly false), a leaflet written by Mr. Ponsonby (who has no connection with its directorate, and is not on its literary staff) wrote a leaflet which appeared in the "New York Times," and was found in a German trench!

We can only assume that the general cause assigned for this act is no less baseless than the detailed excuses which its several authors advance, and that *THE NATION* was struck at for political reasons, because, as Mr. Austin Harrison suggests in the "English Review," it advocates a peace "not on knock-out lines," but on those of Mr. Wilson, to be achieved, as peace has always been achieved since the world was organized into settled States, by arrangement between the combatants.

But for the moment we desire to deal with another example of the working of this Hidden Hand. The matter is one on which we imagine the American Government and the American Press will desire further enlightenment. This is the case of the suppression of an article addressed by Mr. Norman Angell to the "New Republic." The circumstances are as follows:—

When Mr. Norman Angell was last in America he endeavored in lectures and writings to show the hopelessness and ineffectiveness of American neutrality if ever a collective effort was to be made towards a secure international order. This view of Mr. Angell's proved to be of great service to this country in deciding the point whether or no America should come in. The "New Republic," the most powerful exponent of Mr. Wilson's international policy, made the following reference to Mr. Angell's support of the President's declaration that "no nation can any longer remain neutral as against any wilful disturbance of the peace of the world." The "New Republic" said:—

"This attack on neutrality originated with a man who should have the credit for it. It originated with Mr. Norman Angell. . . . Mr. Angell spent last winter in the United States, lecturing and writing. In the weeks preceding the last crisis with Germany over the 'Sussex,' he formulated the doctrine that neutrality was obsolete. It emerged after hours of discussion on the basis of memoranda which were recast many times. The results reached the President, not only directly, but through his confidential advisers. Mr. Norman Angell

. . . served his country and ours beyond all Englishmen who have come to us since the war began. Most of the semi-official visitors have hurt more than they have helped by their insensibility to America and their moral pretentiousness. But Mr. Angell quickly and effectively did an incalculable amount to convince leaders of American Liberalism of their international responsibilities. He drew us closer to that England with which alone an Anglo-American understanding is possible."—Sept. 16th, 1916.)

Now, mark what followed. On March 2nd (a month before the declaration of war), Mr. Angell received the following cable from the Editor of the "New Republic":—

"Could you send us by deferred cable, article thousand words, emphasizing value of American participation in war. Now strong pacifist opposition to participation here, which might be influenced by such article.—Herbert Croly."

On the same subject, Mr. Walter Lippmann, a very important American publicist, wrote to Mr. Angell:—

"Before this reaches you you will have had a cable from Croly asking you for an article that we could print immediately. . . . We have had an exceedingly hard time in this country dealing with the pacifists, who simply want to avoid trouble, and we feel that an article from you, justifying America's entrance into the war on Liberal and international grounds would be of immense help to us. . . . We all know what we owe to you in convincing us of the justice of this view. . . . and in preparing the background of ideas which would convince Americans now in power of the necessity of their taking an active rôle in the war."

Mr. Angell immediately wrote the article, which was entitled, "An Appeal to American Pacifists," urging the friends of internationalism to drop their opposition to American participation in the war, and to direct their efforts, instead, to making that participation a practical means to their real ends. Mr. Angell's reasons for believing that America's entrance into the war might help to promote international ideals were set forth at length.

The cable was handed in on March 5th. On inquiry at the Cable Company's office next morning, Mr. Angell was told that it had been despatched. Three weeks later, however, he learned by letter from the Editor of the "New Republic" that he had never received it. Mr. Angell then applied to the Press Bureau. He was told that the cable was suppressed. He was also informed, in accordance with the courteous practice of this department, that they were under no obligation to notify the sender of a telegram of its suppression, although Mr. Angell had accompanied the cable with a note to the Censor explaining the circumstances of its despatch, and adding that if it was thought desirable to modify anything in it he would do so. The Press Bureau official (who happened in this case to be Sir E. T. Cook himself) replied that the department could take no account of communications of that sort. The cable had been suppressed "by due authority."

It would seem, therefore, that the true object of this suppression is to discourage the exchange of Liberal opinions between this country and America, now an Ally in the war, even when those opinions are directed to producing—as they have produced—American co-operation in that enterprise, and to modifying opinion hostile to that decision.

A London Diary.

LONDON, FRIDAY.

MR. GEORGE's speech at Guildhall reminds me that once before in our history an oration to the City was delivered by a British Prime Minister in the midst of a great war. There, save for a common and valuable quality of energy and confidence in success, the resemblance ends. Pitt was Pitt and Mr. George is Mr. George; and while the first talked chiefly of his country, the second talked mostly of himself. This

jarring note of egotism might have been saved if Mr. George could have risen to Pitt's conception of a common national effort, which, indeed, in spite of all divergencies and his own liberal additions to them, has kept the country substantially united, and which was the theme of Mr. Asquith's fine speech to the Eighty Club. But when he calls on the people to compare his own ever-ready, ever-resourceful Government with the company of sluggards in which he was only the second figure and not the first, he forces the comparison that a statesman with a certain fineness of character would have avoided, not for his own sake, but for his country's. Take the submarine problem. Mr. George admits that he and his colleagues, past and present, have had it before them for two and a-half years, and that they have not solved it in the way in which it ought to have been solved—i.e., by sinking the submarines rather than by under-feeding the inhabitants of these islands. How, then, does he escape responsibility? I do not suppose that Sir Edward Carson is more or less of a failure at the Admiralty than was Mr. Balfour, of whose negligence we are reaping the fruits. But Mr. George could have altered all this. He was the most powerful individual in the late Government, and he had filled two out of the three Ministries of Defence. He could have produced an "activist" Admiralty whenever he wished.

BUT Mr. George did nothing for the Navy, for the simple reason that his living interest was not then in ships, but in men. There was a party in the late Government that worked hard to save men for the land, for the Navy, for the shipyard, and proposed the only remedy, a greater concentration and economy of military adventure. Who was their opponent? Who but Mr. George, the Conscriptionist, the Mediterraneanist? There was the excuse for him that he saw more of the military side of the war and less of the naval. But the claim he makes for himself is that of *prévoyant* statesmanship. What, then, did he foresee? Not the dearth of the fields. Not the call on the shipyards. Not the strain on transport. He extemporizes well enough. But extemporization is a poor substitute for the great arts of preparation and foresight.

BUT I find the grand defect of the Guildhall speech in its want of imagination. There are two new *great* facts of the war—the American intervention and the Russian revolution. Mr. George was virtually silent on both of them. But what a chance for him, the first "people's Premier," to salute that double advent of democracy! I learn from many Russians how eagerly men's ears were set to catch the welcome of the English people, and what a chill spread over new Russia from those cold, self-regarding accents of his and Mr. Law's. Or take America's entry into the war. Its material significance cannot be underrated, for it concludes the result. Germany knows that even if she could destroy our command of the seas, America has it in her power to exclude her from them. Still more important is it that a *real* force of pacification has now entered the world, and that the community of living, which is Europe, has a fair, and not remote, chance of being set up again. Is not this a prospect which the stoutest waver of war may welcome, if he thinks of international society as a statesman is bound to think of it?

I AM interested to hear from the War Office that the ban on THE NATION, or on any publication that comes under its censure, will be removed when it is found to be "free from statements calculated by their effect upon opinion in enemy countries to prolong the war." I rather thought that the crime of THE NATION lay in its effort not to lengthen, but to shorten the war by a premature introduction of the Serpent of Peace into the Earthly Paradise in which we live. But, as the War Office has laid down this standard of offence, I will freely present it with an excellent example of it. Dr. Helfferich, the German Minister of the Interior, addressing the Reichstag last Saturday, took as his text Mr. George's ad-

mission that the question of ships was decisive of the issue of the war, and his and Lord Devonport's further confessions of the shortage of our food stocks. Therefore, concluded Dr. Helfferich, "we (the Germans) stand secure," and with steady nerves, the war was won. Now it is not a question of whether Mr. George painted our affairs too darkly; the test of the War Office arises in the fact that the Germans have used his words and those of Lord Devonport to sustain their warfare against us. There is no such proof (and, in the nature of the case, can be none) against THE NATION. There is direct proof in the case of Mr. George.

I WILL go a little further. The War Office has now the means of discovering that Sir Edward Carson's speeches on the submarine danger, and the lavish embroidery of the same subject by the "Times" and the "Mail" have been direct factors in the German decision to carry on this campaign and in the disappearance of the opposition to it. This is not theory, but solid fact. In his speech yesterday Lord Curzon declared that he had received from a British agent in a neutral country the statement that a *million* copies of an article "from a prominent English newspaper" on the food position and the effect of the submarines were being circulated in Germany on May Day "as a sign of Great Britain's weakness, and for the encouragement of the prosecution of the war." It is pretty obvious that Lord Curzon means the "Times," and I have therefore to direct the War Office to the fact that it has bound itself to stop the circulation of the offending newspaper, and to ask it what it proposes to do.

As there appeared in this column some of the earliest warnings of the submarine danger, it is an appropriate place for suggesting that its character has been overdrawn. There is no more prospect of our starvation than of an Allied march on Berlin. Both are extreme visions of the war, springing from brains that have never taken a true measure of it. I imagine the Navy has had (quite recently) successes that have not been recorded. And there are means of restricting our transport which reasons of war policy, never accepted by many of our soldiers, have hitherto forbidden.

BUT let me come nearer to the cause of the War Office ban on THE NATION. Its psychology clearly consists in the belief that the enemy regards a moderate statement of British aims as an encouragement of his arms. I imagine that the evidence to the contrary effect is overwhelming, and I do not believe that any American statesman or publicist would question it. The use made in Germany of the "Knock-out" interview, and the German decision to take the maximum interpretation of Mr. Balfour's Note, to treat it as a document of dismemberment, and to make it the excuse for the submarine campaign, are the capital instances of this process. That, of course is in strict line with the official German view of the war. It was "a war of defence." The selfish Britisher wanted to "encircle" Germany before the war, and destroy her afterwards. That plea (and the Russian bogey) drew German Socialism into the war, just as it now fights the growing national loathing of it. Now that the two great Republics have come in on their policy of Internationalism no other whip to flog the failing spirit of war exists. Therefore, it is not the appeal of Liberalism in which the German propaganda deals; for only by warding off its impact on the German masses (the middle classes are probably still Jingo) can the legend of an heroic struggling patriotism, the legend of 1806, be kept going. Could anything be clearer?

PRINCE ALEXANDER OF BATTENBERG's engagement to Lord Londesborough's daughter is not to be an isolated incident. It suggests a considered Royal policy to marry the King's sons and daughters to British subjects rather than foreign princes.

A WAYFARER.

Life and Letters.

THE MORAL OF MAY DAY.

It is easy in these anxious days of dearth to grasp the primitive meaning of May Day. The ancient Aryan husbandman had as little confidence in the benevolence and wisdom of the capricious deities and under-deities who presided over the fertility of his fields, as we have ourselves in our dictators and under-dictators. One could no more assume that Priapus would do his duty by the fruit-trees than one can be sure that the Food Controller will deal wisely with potatoes. Magic was the self-help of the provident farmer. On the "appointed day" he would go out into his fields, and there perform the imitative ritual which suggested to trees and seeds, to grasses and tubers, that they should be fruitful and multiply. The gaiety of the festival endured after the anxieties which prompted it were forgotten, and it requires the spur of a present alarm to give us a dim perception of its ancient meaning, and to recall the days when mankind was by no means sure that harvest would follow seed-time, if it omitted the due ceremony of slaying the god and burying him in the furrow, or neglected any of the spells or incitements which prompted the seed to germinate and the buds to open.

The modern Socialist festival, like most popular ceremonies, has in it something of the same suggestion of magic. "For one day in the year," the demonstrators seem to say, "we of the proletariat shake off our chains. We omit to enter the doors of the industrial prison-house. We march in our ordered files behind the flag of revolution to prove by this sign that we shall one day be our own masters. We do it year by year in symbol, sure that the symbol will eventually bring the reality." The ritual is not irrational. It is a Passover which points to the deliverance in the future. By this power to strike in nations, and with no regard to the frontiers and the languages which sever them, the working masses of Europe have kept alive the faith in their ultimate deliverance by their own concerted will. The sense of an international comradeship had slowly grown before the war, fostered by these demonstrations, for their significance lay, like that of a Catholic feast-day, in the simultaneous obedience of many peoples to the same thought. The third year of the war, by some obscure impulse, has revived the holiday which had become too much of a mockery for observation. The Russians have celebrated their newly-found liberty. The English Labor movement, always backward and always insular, which had substituted the first Sunday in May for May Day itself, will next Sunday send its congratulations to the Russian comrades. It is the Germans and the Austrians who have managed, in spite of the absence of youth, to conduct a real combative demonstration. The Austrian movement was so general that the police took the part of wisdom, and rather fraternized with the strikers than repressed them. It called for peace, and there it did not differ from its rulers. What exactly happened in Germany we do not yet know. There were demonstrations, in spite of the threats and prohibition, and if (as we are told) all was calm, it must have been because the authorities did not venture to disturb the peace. So, with inordinate difficulty, with the world's military machine against it, the shattered International struggles towards restoration. Frontiers and passports, blockades and submarines, prohibitions and prejudices, check its ambassadors in their effort to meet at Stockholm. But for one day in our three years' war a common idea has united crowds of workers in Berlin, Vienna, and Petrograd.

It was the common belief in the early months of the war that this catastrophe had destroyed the International. The most optimistic hoped that when it was over, an effort would be made to patch up discords, and restore at least the public appearance of common action. If it can be restored, our own belief is that it must be restored during the war itself. The only

effective method of restoring it will be the common action, each in its own land, of Socialist parties to combat Imperialism and prepare a peace without conquests. Were it not for the Russian object-lesson, it would be difficult to hope. For the moral which emerges from the outbreak of the war, is that the International professions of all the Socialist and Labor movements had been largely the repetition of an empty shibboleth. Until the test came, every party had repeated the same formulæ: all of them had denounced wars as a typical product of capitalism, and all of them had professed (though with significant variations) that the action in war of proletarian parties must differ in some very marked way from that of middle-class parties. When the crucial hour struck, the anxiety of most of them was, on the contrary, to declare their absolute solidarity with other classes. We do not blame them for obeying the call to arms as others did, for when once war has begun, the idea of national defence is paramount, even when the "defence" happens to be organized on other people's territories. The notion that a working-class, with little leisure and no historical training, could thread its way through the mazes of secret diplomacy, and form a more objective judgment on the moral issues of a war than the leisured and educated classes do, was doomed to disappointment. The faith of the Extremists in the efficacy of a general strike to prevent war seems to-day so futile that one marvels that able men should ever have paused to discuss it. The test of the war has none the less partially justified the saner hopes of International Socialism. With much backsliding, some cowardice, and some treachery, some of the Socialist parties have at least done a part of their duty in resisting extravagant war-aims, and in forwarding movements likely to shorten this war and to promote an enduring peace. The early record of work of the German Majority leaders makes dismal reading, and to-day they lie open to Bernstein's indictment that they have acted mainly as the "train-bearers" of the German Chancellor. But that of the Minority has done much to keep alive our charity towards their party and their race. On behalf of the Majority, it can only be noted that they stood, on paper, for a programme of "no annexations." The entire French party has this to its credit: that it unanimously welcomed President Wilson's great address to the Senate, and adopted as its own his definition of a constructive peace. Another breakdown, it must be confessed, has been in our own country. Not even by a perfunctory formal resolution has our Labor Party opposed the more extravagant items of the programme of our own Imperialists, its designs of annexation, and its proposal to split the world after the war by a system of preferences and boycotts. Some of its leaders actively support this policy, and the opposition to it comes only from the small minority grouped round the Independent Labor Party. The hope of the immediate future is that a free wind from revolutionary Russia and democratic America will play upon the whole Party.

Unless we may hope everything from the organized sanity of democracies, it is hard to see anywhere a guarantee of security and peace. We have not yet exhausted all the implications of the submarine campaign. It means, for the moment, a threat to our own food supply and our own supremacy at sea. But it may mean, for the future, much more than this. It may mean that success in war will no longer depend on vast national efforts, made publicly, after violent and open campaigns to raise the taxes and tighten the machinery of conscription. It may mean that gigantic armies and huge, visible, slowly-growing fleets are no longer the only instruments of victory. If the submarine does not reach the dimensions of the battle-cruiser, and science does not discover an adequate counter-attack, any capable Government, which has access by one good port to the ocean, if it has science and large industrial resources behind it, and with these things the official machinery which allows a prompt and secret action, could in a few months of concentrated effort prepare the submarine fleet which might ensure

it the mastery of the seas. The old instruments of domination did, at least, require a measure of national assent, and they were prepared only after open debate. All the world knew when Germany was building Dreadnoughts, and even autocratic Russia could not increase its army effectives without public speeches in the Duma. An under-water fleet might be built so swiftly that it might be created without official avowal or Parliamentary consent, and, even if we had knowledge of its preparation, the means of defence are yet to seek.

Such inventions as this, and there may be others in the teeming brain of science, are a weapon designed for the hand of a secretive, warlike class. They are the stiletto which any autocratic government may hide in its cloak. There can be no guarantee against their abuse, save in the victory everywhere of democracies which lack the motive and the will to use them. An impressive victory to-day, and a crushing peace to follow it, would be no insurance against this peril. It might even be the very condition which would tempt the defeated empire to have early recourse to it. It is simple to suppose that the Junker will draw from a decisive defeat the moral that he ought to have avoided aggression. He is capable of arguing that his only error lay in refraining too long from the ruthless maximum use of his submarines. Our only hope of security lies in the transference of power from the hands of him and his cousins in all lands to those of the democracy. A change of that kind will not be lasting unless it be general. If the Junker survives in Berlin we may see, sooner or later, the restoration in Petrograd, not perhaps of a rejuvenated Tsardom, but at least of a powerful military dictatorship. If Imperialism reigns in London, it will sooner or later (whatever may happen in the interval) recall Junkerdom in Berlin. The argument of self-defence will everywhere delay the reality of democracy, while any negation of it remains.

The old tactics of the International were profoundly right. It was its working maxim that the first political duty of each national proletarian party was to oppose and overcome its own native Imperialists. The International collapsed because war everywhere broke down this internal conflict of ideals, and set every Socialist Party denouncing, not the Junker at home, but only the enemy abroad. International democracy will return to its healthy and normal state only when the democratic parties everywhere return to this primary function. "Go home," said the Russian Kerensky to the British and French Labor Delegates, "and overcome your own Imperialists as we have vanquished ours." That is the moral of May Day and the indispensable basis of any international movement.

"AN EYE FOR AN EYE."

We should have supposed that a thrill of pride went through every British heart when, after the successful and most gallant action of the destroyers "Swift" and "Broke" in the Channel, our Admiralty added to their report the words: "We were fortunate in being able to save the lives of ten German officers and 108 men from the vessels which were sunk." We should have supposed that anyone bred in these islands would have said in his heart: "That is the fine way of doing things and saying things"; and, having read the words, he would have confronted the dangers and horrors of the time with renewed confidence in our race, and increased admiration for its qualities. Such, at all events, was our own feeling, and, in all the splendid records of our countrymen's heroism and magnanimity during the war, there are few deeds and few sentences which have given us prouder satisfaction.

But, to our astonishment, we find that there is at least one man among us who feels no such pride, no such elation. Apparently, there are more than one, for we may assume that the editor who admits this person's views into his paper, not as a letter but as an article, does, to some extent, share and favor them. The article

foams and splutters with hatred or contempt through a column and a-quarter of last Sunday's "National News." In the hope that our readers could not of themselves imagine the fury to which that simple narrative, to us so heroic, could rouse human beings of a different nature, we may quote a few of the sentences:—

"I do not think," says this anonymous writer, "that there is another country in the world the Government officials of which would be daring enough, or idiotic enough, to send out a report couched in such terms."

"There is no country in the world, I imagine, where in one day a high ecclesiastical dignitary" (we will come to his offence later on) "and a responsible Government official could pen such crassly idiotic words and messages. Do they realize for a single moment the import of their language? Cannot they see that they are making their country and their countrymen and countrywomen a laughing-stock throughout the whole world?"

"Nothing could be calculated to throw contempt on the nation so much as official folly of this description."

"I do not think it is sufficiently realized how very much harm this kind of sentimentality, this weak-kneed action on behalf of some of our leaders, is doing to the country generally, and to the whole great cause of the war in particular."

"We must put an end to this trifling, this appalling, contemptible weakness."

So, as we said, the writer foams and splutters through a column and a-quarter, showing how entirely mistaken we were in our belief that every heart would leap up at the Admiralty's words, as at the sight of a rainbow in the midst of storm. What, in our ignorance, we believed that everyone would recognize as a fine instance of natural generosity, is described by this writer as "cruel irony, wicked thoughtlessness, and criminal folly." So true it is that you can never sound the lowest depths of man's nature, or assume agreement upon what looks like obvious truth. He writes under the initials "A. M. de B.," which suggests a French descent. But, lest we should be doing injustice to that noble people who are now our Allies, we may mention that our Admiralty's report, far from making us a laughing-stock throughout the whole world, has been received with enthusiasm by the French Press, and we may quote from a French paper which is very far removed from "sentimentality and weak-kneed action." In the issue of April 23rd, the "Gaulois" says:—

"Yesterday the British declared themselves happy in saving German sailors. That is civilization; that is humanity. Some days earlier we read that a German submarine had sunk a hospital ship without even attempting to come to the help of the wounded it carried. That is 'Kultur'; that is barbarity."

The anonymous writer's abuse of our "ecclesiastical dignitary" as "crassly idiotic" opens a slightly different subject. He is referring to the Bishop of Ely, and to a letter upon "Reprisals," which Dr. Chase sent to the "Times" on April 19th. In that letter the Bishop expressed the profound regret felt by many at the news that Allied airmen had dropped bombs on the open town of Freiburg, and injured and killed women and children. The raid was ordered as a reprisal for the German crime of sinking hospital ships, and Dr. Chase maintains that, unspeakably great as has been the provocation, a policy of reprisals is useless, because the German Government will care nothing for the death of a few civilians, and we shall have started a competition in frightfulness in which we shall not contend on equal terms; that it will prove disastrous, because we cannot now appear with clean hands at the great assize which will follow the war, but shall have had our share in lowering the standard of international morality; and that such a policy of reprisals is essentially wrong. To the writer in the "National News" these arguments seem "so feeble, so futile that it appears almost a waste of time to attempt to refute" them. He adds a good deal about Apaches, tigress's fangs, and assassins; but, apparently, the main ground of his difference with the Bishop lies in his appeal to the Old Testament:—

"There are times," he writes, "when the old

scriptural *lex talionis* is not only the best, but the only law. 'An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a nail for a nail.' That is a sound Old Testament maxim, and who are we, or who is any one of our Bishops who can, or would dare, to refute it?"

We agree that, if that law of retaliation is to be taken as an eternal law of God, neither "A. M. de B." nor any Bishop should attempt to refute it. But as Christ has been beforehand with a refutation, and speaks with higher authority even than "A. M. de B.," or the Bishops (who are His servants), we are content to leave the matter to Him. For there is a passage in the Gospel of St. Matthew v., 38 which seems to have escaped the notice of "A. M. de B."—the passage in which Christ said:—

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, that ye resist not evil."

We suppose that even the writer in the "National News" would hardly ask who is Christ that He should dare to refute the sound Old Testament maxim? If he maintains Old Testament maxims as sound and eternally binding for the modern, civilized, and nominally Christian world, he will find much to delight his heart in the early Old Testament books. He will find, for instance, the commands which Joshua carried out so thoroughly when he utterly destroyed Jericho and Ai, Makkedah, Libnah, Lachish, Eglon, Hebron, Debir, Hazor, and other cities of ancient Palestine. Time after time we read in the history of that appalling annihilation such sentences as "All that fell that day, both men and women, were twelve thousand"; "He left none remaining, but utterly destroyed all that breathed"; "They smote them with the edge of the sword, and utterly destroyed all the souls that were therein"; "There was not any left to breathe, and they burnt Hazor with fire." In short, if "A. M. de B." wishes us to adopt Old Testament maxims as permanently binding, he will convert war into a series of exterminating massacres, surpassing in atrocity even the German methods of warfare, which he justly condemns. It is always possible, however, that this primitive writer has never heard of Christianity or of a "New Dispensation," whereas the Bishop of Ely has. And, naturally, that makes all the difference.

It may be said that it does not matter what such a person thinks; nor would it matter if the Leader of the House of Commons were not at one with him as to the policy of reprisals. When questioned by Mr. Molteno as to the report that fifty-six women and children had been killed or injured by the airmen's raid on Freiburg, and asked whether the War Cabinet thought this in accord with the high principles of humanity for which we are fighting, Mr. Bonar Law replied that these considerations were fully weighed by the Government before taking any action. When further asked by Mr. France whether the best reprisal was not to fight and beat the Germans according to British traditions on land and sea, Mr. Bonar Law agreed, but added: "We think also that under certain circumstances reprisals are inevitable—(cheers)." There we get the fatal word "inevitable," which always rises like the ghost of evil to plead excuse for any abomination, from the first violation of Belgium onward to the sinking of the last neutral ship with all her crew by a piratical submarine. When will rulers learn that no crime is inevitable, and it is better to stand before the great assize of Time with clean hands than to gain such material advantage as Germany gained in Belgium, or to glut a passion of revenge by the slaughter of innocents?

Yet "A. M. de B." and the Chancellor of the Exchequer find supporters for their doctrine of indiscriminate vengeance. Major-General Desmond O'Callaghan has written to the "Times," recounting with natural horror the abominable methods of German warfare, the killing and wounding of women and children by Zeppelin raids, and so on through a hideous catalogue; and in revenge he calls upon "the manhood of the country to back up Mr. Bonar Law and to insist upon reprisals being undertaken with such energy as will give

our enemies pause." In the House of Commons, Colonel Lowther asked whether we could not inform the German Government that unless they spared Laon Cathedral and other buildings of purely aesthetic value, reprisals would be taken upon Cologne Cathedral and other monuments cherished by the German people, when opportunity permits. The mention of Cologne seems to us unfortunate, for the loss of that cathedral would never count as a balance to Laon and Reims; but, beneath such minor valuations, there still lies the idea of reprisal as justified or advantageous, and we notice that the insistence upon reprisals as inevitable was received in the House of Commons with cheers. Lord Curzon also, in answer to the Archbishop of Canterbury in the House of Lords, assured the country that, even including this Freiburg incident, we should be able at the end of the war to claim that we had come out of it with unstained honor and clean hands.

Against this powerful but peculiar combination of "A. M. de B.," Mr. Bonar Law, the rest of the War Cabinet, the Major-General, the Colonel, and the cheering members of Parliament, we are glad to be able to set an excellent letter written to the "Times" by Sir Edward Clarke on April 27th. He protests against the Major-General's attempt "to excuse our bombardment of an unfortified German town by dwelling upon the horrible character of the outrages on the laws of war and the instincts of humanity which have been committed by our enemies." "Does he not see," he asks, "that the more indignant we are at these outrages, the greater will be our shame and disgrace if we imitate them?" "For two years," he goes on, "our public writers and speakers have been justly denouncing the Germans as murderers and baby-killers, and now we are to lower ourselves to their level by copying their crimes." He further quotes a passage from a letter written earlier in the war by Field-Marshal Sir Evelyn Wood in protest against reprisals:—

"I believe and trust that our fighting Services will never sink to such deeds of infamy, but, moreover, the arguments in favor of such policy are based on ignorance of war. Marshal Marmont, after an experience of twenty years of such a system, wrote, *Les représailles sont toujours inutiles.*"

Even when confronted with the combined forces of the Prime Minister, "A. M. de B.," the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord Curzon, and the rest, we prefer to stand with the veteran Field-Marshal, the Bishop of Ely, and Sir Edward Clarke.

When Bacon was meditating on "Unity in Religion," he wrote:—

"It was great blasphemy when the devil said, 'I will ascend and be like the Highest'; but it is greater blasphemy to personate God, and bring Him in saying, 'I will descend and be like the prince of darkness.'"

To induce our enemy to commit the former blasphemy and ascend in an endeavor to be like the Highest, would be no unworthy aim. But at all costs let us ourselves avoid the greater blasphemy of supposing that we personate God by imitating the prince of darkness, against whom mankind has striven from the beginning of time, and often with such poor result.

Present-Day Problems.

DEVELOPING THE EMPIRE.

WE referred briefly last week to the Empire Resources Development Committee and to its advertised objects. The matter is of sufficient importance to warrant fuller treatment. The Committee was formed early this year at a private meeting presided over by Lord Milner. In a letter to the press the Hon. Secretary of the Committee explained that Lord Milner's other duties prevented his accepting the chairmanship of the Committee, which had been offered him. It may be noted, therefore, at the outset, that a Member of the War Cabinet is the foster-parent of the Committee. Failing Lord Milner, the Committee secured Sir Starr Jameson,

Chairman of the British South Africa Company, for its Chairman, and Mr. William Fox, a director of the same company, for its Hon. Secretary. The manifesto of the Committee had better be given in full:—

"We, the undersigned, realizing the immense latent resources of the Empire, and the possibility of developing this great and varied wealth for State purposes, under State auspices, and so lifting from the peoples of the Empire the burdens caused by the war, have formed ourselves into a committee for the following purposes:—

(1) To advocate—

(a) The conservation for the benefit of the Empire of such natural resources as are, or may come,* under the ownership or control of the Imperial, Dominion, or Indian Governments.

(b) The development of selected resources of the Empire under such conditions as will give to the State an adequate share of the proceeds.

(c) The appointment in due time of a Board for the conservation and development of the resources of the Empire, so that Imperial effort may be concentrated on assets ripe for development for the common good of the Empire.

(2) To take such action as may from time to time appear to be desirable in order to disseminate information in regard to the objects of the committee, to arouse and maintain public interest, to enlist public sympathy and support, and to co-operate with other committees and associations having similar objects."

The signatories to the manifesto include Mr. John Hodge, Minister for Labor; Lord Islington, Parliamentary Secretary to the India Office; Sir L. Worthington Evans, M.P., Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Munitions; Mr. Alfred Bigland, M.P., Controller of Oils, Margarine, &c.; Sir Henry Birchenough, another director of the British South African Company; Earl Grey, a former director; Sir William Bull, M.P.; the Earl of Plymouth; the Earl of Selborne; Mr. Henry Page Croft, and others.

Being now familiar with the general objects and personnel of the Committee, we may pass to an examination of the machinery which is to ensure this "conservation" and "development" of our Imperial resources, as set forth in the official circular. The Committee is quite clear that the Civil Service must "not be used." Indeed, the State is abjured to "shake itself free from Civil Service precedents, which furnish no guide to the value of live business men . . ." So the "Imperial Board," which is to be the governing body for the purposes recommended by the Committee, is to consist of twenty of these "live business men," who are to be paid for their labors, and who will condescend to share control with a "small number of leading Civil Servants." At this point the desire to relieve the "peoples of the Empire" from the burdens caused by the war, which figures prominently in the manifesto, recedes somewhat into the background, and the desire of the "live business men" to earn profits is proportionately in evidence. Joint Stock Corporations, which are to be formed, and their bondholders will expect "the State" to offer "very handsome inducements, by way of percentages on profits, to the men whose competence will determine the issues of such great operations† . . ."

This essay in Imperialistic-State-Socialism is interesting. But it is only when we consider more specifically the "great operations" the Committee has in view, that we begin to be really edified.

The official circular makes it clear that the Committee's proposals are directed primarily to the Crown Colonies and Protectorates, and the first suggestion is that "the State should control the production of vegetable oils and fats raised in the tropical possessions of the Crown." The official circular does not itself go into further particulars. For more detailed enlightenment we must turn to the documents which accompany the circular, and to the speeches and lectures of the Committee's members. The chief natural reserve of vegetable oils is, of course, British tropical Africa, and British Tropical Africa is described throughout this accessory literature as the principal field for the Committee's proposed Imperial exploitation. In a document ornate with sundry titles and sub-titles, which include "Public ownership of our Empire Estate. A vast property for the whole commonwealth. How the Worker may be saved from the War Taxation penalty," and addressed "To

the Organized Workers of Great Britain," we read of the "neglect to cultivate the fertile growth and wondrous natural plantation-wealth and soil-wealth of West Africa and East Africa . . . the palm-oil industry in particular." "These," it is said a little further on, "be the properties and resources belonging to the State," and, immediately afterwards, printed in capitals: "The project is to take this possession of the State, that is, of the Empire, before it has passed into private ownership, and to utilize it for the State." It will be observed that the "live business men" do not obtrude themselves in this appeal to the workers. We are given a quotation from a speech made by Lord Milner on "a famous occasion": "If you were to value West Africa to-day and again twenty years hence, you would find the value would have gone up by a thousand per cent." As ex-Chairman of the Bank of British West Africa, Ltd., Lord Milner may be presumed to speak as an expert on the subject. The working man is implored to

"Peer into the future. These limitless areas—West Africa in particular—yield certain articles which are an absolute necessity to our civilization . . . 'I say without hesitation'—says an authority whom the Government has already seen it well to trust in matters of this character—'that if this trade were organized on an Empire basis we could make £15,000,000 a year for the reduction of the Empire debt.' . . . The property is ours as an asset to be worked for the Empire."*

A further document, entitled "The Empire Resources Committee: What its aims are," lays particular stress upon the "undeveloped resources" of tropical Africa, and the public is assured that, thanks to the Committee, "in tropical Africa, native populations, numbering many millions, will be able to sell their products, and earn good wages under healthy conditions." In an address on the Committee's projects, delivered to the Colonial section of the Royal Society of Arts on February 27th last, Mr. Alfred Bigland, M.P., lays special stress on British West Africa, its oil-palms, and its cocoa plantations:—

"Think what it would mean if all these products of West Africa . . . were controlled for the benefit of the Empire as a whole! Think how huge is the potential profit which could be devoted to the service of the Empire's debt. . . . The direct profit from the West African produce by no means exhausts the benefits which would result from the possession and the development by the State of the trade in such produce.† . . . Here is a way in which the State can conscript wealth without hurting anyone—that is, the State can conscript the State's own wealth and make itself wealthier still."

Nor is this all. The State can at the same time become a philanthropic institution:—

"The proposed development scheme would afford a splendid means of facilitating the civilization of the natives, as their labor would be harnessed to the chariot of progress and productiveness," &c., &c.

But let honor be ascribed to whom honor is due. Rhodesian conception and finance must not be robbed of their proper place in this Imperial scheme. According to Mr. Alfred Bigland, M.P., the Empire Resources Development Committee originated in Mr. Wilson Fox's articles to the "Times" in September, 1916, and in the lecture by the same gentleman to the Royal Society of Arts last December. Mr. Wilson Fox's views are, therefore, of special interest. For him the tropical Crown colonies and protectorates are "State lands," which have been neglected by "Colonial Governors and Civil Servants." The "native population . . . may properly be included in any review of our undeveloped national assets." In Mr. Fox's conception, the rôle of Europeans in these parts of the world is "primarily overseers of native laborers." The way in which the State "can derive profit from its tropical estates is to keep in its own hands the power of producing, trading in, and exporting certain special products"—especially palm products.

In his capacity of a director of the British South Africa Company, Mr. Wilson Fox might perhaps have been a little chary of declaring that "we have given to millions of natives in Africa security of life and property," and are entitled, therefore, to claim that "the natives shall in

* Italics ours.

† The Committee's italics.

‡ "At least 10 per cent." is the minimum figure envisaged by the Committee.

* According to a paper read by Mr. Moreton Frewen, another member of the Committee, in January last, to the North-East Coast Institution of Engineers and Shipbuilders, the "famous occasion" alluded to was an address given by Lord Milner to the Committee itself.

† Italics Mr. Bigland's.

return bear their share of the Imperial burden." Are Mr. Wilson Fox's fellow-countrymen to understand that the British South Africa Company has conferred "security of life and property" on the Mashonas and the Matabele? Public memory is proverbially short, but not quite so short as Mr. Wilson Fox would appear to imagine. For the matter of that the British South Africa Company is at the present moment contending before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council that the "unalienated"* lands of Southern Rhodesia are the private property of the shareholders of the British South Africa Company, a contention rejected by the Legislative Council of Southern Rhodesia.†

Such is the project for establishing, shall we say Rhodesianism, in British Tropical Africa.

The whole of the scheme, so far as British West Africa—the home of the oil-palm—is concerned, is based upon false politics and false economics. The land of British West Africa does not belong to the British State. It belongs to the native communities, and the fact is explicitly, or implicitly, recognized in hundreds of agreements made from time to time with these communities, and, thanks to which, a British Protectorate has, in the main peaceably, been accepted by them. With the exception of a few restricted and, compared with the vast areas affected, quite insignificant districts which have become influenced by European ideas, the whole of the land in our West African Protectorates is held under customary tenure based upon the principles that every individual within the community has a right to share in the land's bounties, but that the ultimate ownership of the land remains in the community, and that the land cannot be permanently alienated from the community. For the British State to advance a claim to ownership of the land in the West African Protectorates, would be in the nature of an immense expropriation. Again, the idea sedulously fostered by the committee's propaganda that the natural wealth of British West Africa is running to waste because the native communities do not exploit it, is untrue. The sum of labor effort put out by the natives of Southern Nigeria, for example, in the palm-oil and kernel industry is immense. Virtually, the entire population—men, women, and children—is continuously engaged all the year round in this native-created and native-maintained industry: gathering, preparing, and transporting the product to the European trading stations. The annual value of the trade runs into many millions sterling, it provides the principal freightage for the fleet of steamers engaged in the West African trade, and gives employment to tens of thousands of workers in Britain. Moreover, the palm-oil tree and its fruits are an indispensable factor in the domestic life of the native communities, and are an important item in the internal trade of the country. For the British State, in combination with financial corporations, to lay claim to the palm-oil forests would be an invasion of native rights without precedent in British Colonial history.

But the palm-oil industry is not the only industry which the inhabitants of the British West African Protectorate have built up. In the Gold Coast and Ashanti, the native farmers, working as free men on their own land, have created a cocoa industry which has beaten every competing cocoa-growing country and placed this British Protectorate at the head of all the cocoa exporting districts in the world. They have done this in twenty years. And they have done it without European capital, and with no help other than the use of their own arms and brains and the technical assistance of the local Agriculture Department. The cultivation of ground-nuts, cotton, and rubber has also been undertaken by the native communities with successful results. The West African races are essentially commercial races, and fling themselves eagerly into every enterprise which offers them a chance of profit; besides raising all their own foodstuffs. The legend of the "idle native," so far as concerns British West Africa, is a legend either due to ignorance, or one that is fostered for ulterior motives. All this is perfectly well-known to the West African Civil Service, referred to in such disparaging terms in the Committee's literature. The plain fact of the matter is that projects of this kind aim, not at creating new industries and develop-

ing natural resources, but at laying hands upon existing industries created by the natives, and at converting native communities owning their land, developing it in their own right, and for their benefit and ours [since the commercial value of their output calls for a corresponding output of European merchantism], into wage-earners working in the interests of private corporations, in which—under the Committee's scheme—the State would be a partner. Let it be plainly understood that if we embark upon the policy of the Empire Resources Development Committee, in so far as the Crown Colonies and Protectorates are concerned, we embark upon a fatal course—a course which will convert law-abiding and industrious peoples into sullen payers of tribute; a course which will promote war (which in these regions means massacre) all over West Africa; a course which will fail, even from the point of view of shortsighted utilitarianism, for tropical Africa cannot be permanently kept down by force, and, under a régime of expropriation, dries up economically.

The nation must not be allowed in the confusion of a great war to be lured into endorsing schemes subversive of its honor and of its most sacred obligations towards races it has taken under its protection.

Letters to the Editor.

REPRISALS.

SIR,—Will you permit me through your columns to give expression to the gratitude which I feel to the Bishop of Ely for his letter to "The Times" on the subject of reprisals? With every word of that letter I am in full harmony, and I sincerely trust that the fair fame of Great Britain as a belligerent may never again be soiled by any attempt to keep pace with the Germans in their brutality.—Yours, &c.,

EDWARD FRY.

Failand House, Failand, near Bristol.

"LORD OF THE SABBATH."

SIR,—The very beautiful article on this subject which appeared in THE NATION of April 28th makes me regret more than ever that our military authorities forbid your paper to cross the Atlantic. This article would come as an evangel to our American Allies, for the English and Scotch Sabbath, preserved in Eastern Canada, has not succeeded in gaining a permanent foothold in the United States. The first half of the article might be blotted out by the censor, but the latter half is the most eloquent vindication of the very principle for which I am contending. It is humanity which profits by the Sabbath; though it is only Divinity that can preserve it for us. Can anyone seriously contend, that if the Biblical sanction were withdrawn, and the management of our social life were left to men who have not the fear of God before their eyes nor the Christian motive for preserving the day, we should maintain the institution in the modern world? It requires a Sunday Society in England, and an Archbishopial utterance added, to break down the sanction of the long generations in which men believed that the Decalogue was God's Law; but the Sunday Society cannot get back the Day of Rest when the weary world begins to long for it; and I greatly fear that an Archbishop's edict cannot make again the sanctity which came down to us out of a hoary past.

But will your readers consider this: Could any committee of enlightened persons to-day—say the members of your staff, which, evidently, includes some of the ablest men in the country, and not a few of the greatest masters of English among us—draw up a Decalogue, which could compete with the Ten Words of Moses? I wish they would try. Could they select ten precepts which would so tersely express the essential conditions of wholesome human life, which could show so clearly the nature of God, the duties of man, and the relation between human morality and the Divine Being? Of course, we all know that no other religion has ever produced so monumental and authoritative a code, but could even our most enlightened and considerate leaders of thought even now do so? I believe everyone would recognize the impossibility.

But this Code came into being fifteen centuries B.C., among a people who were in the primitive stage of human culture; a people escaping from a servile condition, and approaching a hostile land, in which they were to establish their polity and their religion.

Such an epitome of the fundamental conditions of human well-being, arising at such a time, among such a people, requires explanation. In any case it is a miracle. That is to say, it came not from man or human legislators, but from God.

No doubt there are agnostics who do not think that we have

* I.e., the lands not alienated to white settlers, companies, syndicates, &c.

† Cd. 7509.

any definite commandments of God. But surely, if we have any definite commandments of God, these Ten Words are such. They are not Jewish, but human; indeed, it is only because Judaism had these Divine Words, incorporated in its law, that it became the religious teacher of the world. It is not the Mosaic law as a whole which gives the old religion a living place in the world—that is obsolete and neglected, since 70 A.D., when the Temple fell—but it is the Decalogue, this strong, Divine substratum of truth and teaching, on which alone human life can be soundly built. Thus Christ never rescinds it, but only builds on it, and interprets it, and supplies the deeper spiritual sanctions for its observance.—Yours, &c.,

ROBERT F. HORTON.

Hampstead, May Day, 1917.

THE GERMAN TERMS OF PEACE.

SIR,—May I refer to your Editorial Notes of April 28th upon the two statements which have come from America regarding possible terms of peace?

I note that, in your judgment, the two sets of terms which have been reported were put forward for a tactical purpose, and did not reflect the real mind of the German Government. I do not understand this to be the opinion of the American authorities. The fact that America has gone to war is no proof that their opinion has changed. It proves only that at a certain time the German Jingoism, aided by the declaration of the Allies of their intention to break up the Austro-Hungarian Empire, got the upper hand, so that a policy of submarine activity was adopted which, as President Wilson had already stated, must inevitably bring America into the war.

The whole matter is an illustration of the fact, which is always tending to be forgotten, that the policy of any state in practice depends upon the influence of rival schools of thought. The art of playing off one force in Germany against another, which is the function of diplomacy, was used in an extremist direction in the case with which we are dealing. Hence the apparent paradox of the American authorities going to war, although they were of the opinion that the Allies had missed an opportunity of successful negotiation.—Yours, &c.,

NOEL BUXTON.

May 1st, 1917.

THE BAN ON "THE NATION."

SIR,—One of the weaknesses of intellectual Liberalism is the rather tepid character of its supporters: they are by temperament averse from fighting, and their distinctive modesty prevents them from even proffering assistance to one of their own company when attacked; they leave the battle to the vulgar, comforting their aggrieved minds with the ultimate triumph of the time spirit.

Imagine what a hullabaloo would have been raised by the English vulgarians if Mr. Asquith had interfered with the circulation of any journal issued by the Yellow Press. But when THE NATION is mishandled, a few polite expressions of regret appear in the Liberal daily press, and next morning the matter is forgotten. There is no sense of comradeship, no valor, no genuine self-sacrifice in the ranks of intellectual Liberalism. Lord Haldane was thrown to the wolves with hardly a protest, and with no single resignation among his colleagues; a turn of the wheel, and they who abandoned him are themselves clamored out of office; and so it goes on. The Vulgarians win because they are the better pack. They don't scatter, and they keep to the scent.

Those who know the real situation in Europe at the present time, and are well aware of the wholesale misguiding of public opinion by a Press which is only free because it is subservient to the bureaucrats, must be anxious not only to guard THE NATION from interference, but to increase its influence. I would venture, then, to suggest to your readers that they should take a second copy of the paper every week and send it to someone in the provinces whose political opinions they know to be formed by the Yellow Press. And I would also venture to suggest that when the freedom of the instructed and serious Press is so gravely tampered with by the bureaucrats as is now the case with THE NATION, Mr. Asquith himself, and not merely private members of Parliament, should demand an explanation of the Government.

In a few weeks, at any rate, in a few months, the truth will have to be told, and we cannot afford to lose a single paper which has the courage and the good English sense to withstand the public clamor for victories and success, keeping its head, respecting its readers' intelligence, and preparing the national mind for that which is to come.—Yours, &c.,

HAROLD BEGBIE.

Hartfield, Sussex, May 2nd, 1917.

WHAT THE SOLDIERS THINK.

SIR,—Am I right in understanding that THE NATION may not now be sent to the front in France as well as abroad generally? My son (Major —) tells me he has not had the

one for the 12th, and concludes he is not to be allowed them. I wondered if you could send me them each week till the idiotic ban is removed.

May I express my admiration of THE NATION's fearlessness and open-minded criticism and of its attitude generally? I am a constant, though insignificant, reader of THE NATION, and can find no words strong enough to express my dislike, and sorrow, too, at the way it was treated by the W.O. and the Premier. I wish Lloyd George could know and believe the opinion of my son and many other officers at the Front.—Yours, &c.,

OFFICER'S MOTHER.

SIR,—It is apparent that the prohibition of the export of THE NATION is merely the clumsy blundering of bureaucrats impatient of criticism. Annoying as it may be to have these people running amok, probably this little exhibition of their nature will do their class more damage than they could have imagined. It has indicated a very real danger, and should put us on our guard. But as a soldier I would specially like to enter a protest against the impudent perversion of the Premier in misapplying your criticism to the combatant soldier. The soldier has to perform all sorts of objectionable duties and turns, but at least he might be spared the insult of being made the weapon of a particularly shallow piece of political chicanery.

Needless to say, I do not see eye to eye with you on all questions, but I am thankful for you, and look forward to you week by week as a moral and spiritual tonic in a life which inevitably tends to emphasize the physical and material. You, too, almost alone, are giving thoughtful attention to the question of social reconstruction when the war is over. Probably this subject occupies the minds of the civilian soldier in Flanders and elsewhere a great deal more than people think, or even he himself realizes. If he is not provided with a satisfactory answer, he may find one for himself, and it will certainly not be one which will tolerate the blundering bureaucrat at whose clumsy hands he has already suffered far too many things.—Yours, &c.,

CAPTAIN AND ADJUTANT.

SIR,—I am a South African, lately arrived in England on military service. I hear with regret that the circulation of your paper overseas has been stopped. Both my grandfather and my father have always been enthusiastic readers of your columns, and I shall be glad if you will send me your paper weekly that I may mention in my letters items from THE NATION which I know will be much appreciated at home. I enclose a quarter's subscription.—Yours, &c.,

ROYAL FLYING CORPS.

SIR,—I have found during my experience as chaplain in camp, that THE NATION is immensely appreciated by the more thoughtful of the officers and men. The present action of the War Office is condemned by all save a negligible few.—Yours, &c.,

"CHAPLAIN."

[We should be glad if Geo. B. A. Douglas, Will Stanyon, Fred Dwekin, and Horace Stripp would send their address to us, not for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith.—Ed., THE NATION.]

Poetry.

SONG OF REDEMPTION.

I AM a lamb upon the altar,
A soldier dead on the field,
A nun, veiled, withdrawn, at prayer,
A little withered leaf lying at the root of a tree, feeding
the new life,
I am the ecstatic dove in the eagle's talons,
I am the immortality of lovers who rest not here;
These are they who with patience plough the sod and
prepare it, and sow the seed and tend it, against the
time when they will see the ripe wheat waving in the
eternal Realm.
I am Redemption,
I am the Λόγος,
There shall be no more sin,
And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.

EDITH ANNE STEWART.

The World of Books.

THE "NATION" OFFICE, THURSDAY NIGHT.

THE following is our weekly selection of books which we commend to the notice of our readers:—

- "A Memoir of Arthur John Butler." By Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch. (Smith, Elder. 7s. 6d. net.)
 "The Scene of War." By V. C. Scott O'Connor (Odysseus). (Blackwood. 5s. net.)
 "Competition: A Study of Human Motive." By Various Writers. (Macmillan. 3s. 6d. net.)
 "Higher Education and the War." By John Burnet. (Macmillan. 4s. 6d. net.)
 "Thorgils of Treadholt." By Maurice Hewlett. (Ward, Lock. 5s. net.)
 "Ossian en France." Par P. V. Tieghem. (Paris: Rieder. 15 fr.)
 "L'Envolée." Roman. Par E. Dautrin. (Paris: Plon-Nourrit. 3 fr. 50.)

* * *

It was with a good deal of regret that I heard of the disappearance as an independent firm of the publishing house of Smith, Elder & Co. In coming under the management of Mr. John Murray, it has, in a sense, gone back to the paternal roof, for the first George Smith served part of his apprenticeship under the second John Murray, and one of his recollections was that of carrying a bundle of proof-sheets to be corrected by Byron. Like many successful publishers—one might almost say most, for Murray, Macmillan, Blackwood, Chambers, Black, Blackie, and Nelson are but a selection—this first George Smith took the precaution to be born a Scot. He entered into partnership with Alexander Elder, a brother Scot, and their first book, "Sermons and Expositions of Interesting Portions of Scripture," by Dr. John Morison, was issued in 1819. During its existence of just short of a century, the firm has done great things in the world of books. It has published for Ruskin, Charlotte Brontë, Leigh Hunt, Thackeray, the Brownings, George Eliot, Trollope, Mrs. Gaskell, Lever, D. G. Rossetti, Wilkie Collins, Matthew Arnold, Leslie Stephen, and Queen Victoria; it has called into existence the "Cornhill Magazine" and the "Pall Mall Gazette"; and it has produced the "Dictionary of National Biography"—this last one of the finest achievements that has been accomplished by any single firm since publishing began.

* * *

THE first big fish captured by the firm was Ruskin, whose "Modern Painters" Murray refused to publish on commission. Smith seized the chance, but of the five hundred copies that were printed of the first volume, only a hundred and five had been sold at the end of a year. Their next book was "A New Spirit of the Age," written by Richard Hengist Horne and Mrs. Browning in imitation of Hazlitt's more famous gallery of literary portraits. Its outspoken criticism made something of a sensation, and it was fiercely attacked by the reviewers. Then came the discovery of Charlotte Brontë. Her novel, "The Professor," had been offered to six publishers in succession, and Charlotte Brontë has told the world how, almost in despair, she sent it to Smith, Elder & Co., as a "forlorn hope." Instead of the usual curt note of refusal, she received a letter which "declined, indeed, to publish that tale for business reasons, but it discussed its merits and demerits so courteously, so considerately, in a spirit so rational, with a discrimination so enlightened, that this very refusal cheered the author better than a vulgarly-expressed acceptance would have done." The writer added that a work in three volumes would meet with careful attention, and, a month later, "Jane Eyre" was sent in reply to the invitation, and was promptly accepted. The note which cheered Charlotte Brontë was written, not by the second George Smith, who became head of the firm in 1846, but by his literary adviser, William Smith Williams, one of whose grandsons, I may perhaps mention, is Mr. Lowes Dickinson. Williams's judgment and penetration were of great value to the firm, and his relations with Leigh Hunt, Keats, Hazlitt, Thackeray, Browning, and others, would make an interesting chapter of literary gossip.

* * *

How Leigh Hunt came to the firm is another adventure in publishing which George Smith has related. He went one

evening to Peckham to dine with Thomas Powell, a clerk in the counting-house of the City merchants who were supposed to be the originals of the Cheeryble Brothers in "Nicholas Nickleby":—

"While I waited in Powell's little drawing-room for a few minutes before dinner, I took up a neatly-written manuscript which was lying on the table, and was reading it when my host entered the room. 'Ah,' he said, 'that doesn't look worth £40, does it? I advanced £40 to Leigh Hunt on the security of that manuscript, and I shall never see my money again.' When I was leaving, I asked Powell to let me take the manuscript with me. I finished reading it before I went to sleep that night, and next day I asked Powell if he would let me have the manuscript if I paid him the £40. He readily assented, and having got from him Leigh Hunt's address, I went off to him in Edwardes Square, Kensington, explained the circumstances under which the manuscript had come into my possession, and asked whether, if I paid him an additional £60, I might have the copyright. 'You young prince!' cried Leigh Hunt, in a tone of something like rapture, and the transaction was promptly concluded. The work was 'Imagination and Fancy.' It was succeeded by 'Wit and Humor,' and other books, all of which were successful, and the introduction was the foundation of a friendship with Leigh Hunt and the members of his family, which was very delightful to me."

* * *

THIS was not the only example of Smith's generous dealing with authors. He paid Anthony Trollope £2,800 for "The Claverings," and after having read a portion of the manuscript of "Romola"—a *portion*, think of that!—he offered George Eliot £10,000 for the right to issue it in serial and book form. Truly there were giants on the earth in these days, and Smith deserved the compliment that Johnson paid to another publishing Scot: "I respect Millar, sir; he has raised the price of literature."

* * *

FIRST numbers of journals and magazines are interesting to look back at, especially if the journal or magazine has had a fairly long life. The "Pall Mall Gazette," which was started by Smith, began with an issue of eight pages, and cost twopence. It had one signed article—on the American Civil War, by Trollope—strongly supporting the case of the North, and one example of the Occasional Notes that became so brilliant a feature of the journal under Lord Morley's editorship. The "Cornhill" was at first projected simply as a medium for the serial issue of a novel by Thackeray, and the features of its first number were the opening chapters of "Lovel, the Widower," and Trollope's "Framley Parsonage," the latter to be illustrated in later numbers by Millais. The magazine succeeded so well that Smith soon doubled Thackeray's editorial fee of £1,000. Trollope, too, has high praise for the way in which he was treated, and he speaks of Smith's efficiency as an editor after Thackeray had left it, and before Leslie Stephen took control. I understand, by the way, that Mr. Leonard Huxley, the "Cornhill's" editor for some time past, will continue to rule its destinies.

* * *

TALKING about publishers, nothing shall induce me to take sides in the perennial battle they wage with authors. I wish, though, that somebody would compile an anthology of what authors have said about publishers. Byron's gibe about Barabbas is an exploded legend, but even the gentle Charles Lamb grew mordant on this topic. "You know not what a rapacious, dishonest set these booksellers are," he wrote to Bernard Barton. "Those fellows hate us. I contend that a bookseller has a *relative honesty* towards authors, not like his honesty to the rest of the world." And in a letter introducing Moxon to Wordsworth, he says: "When Constable fell from heaven, and we all hoped Baldwin was next [Baldwin was the publisher of the "Essays of Elia"], I turned a slight stove to be sung by a chorus of authors:—

'What should we do when Booksellers break?

We should rejoice.'"

Scott, on the other hand, who suffered heavily from Constable's bankruptcy, wrote to Lockhart: "While I live I shall regret the downfall of Constable, for never did there exist so intelligent and so liberal an establishment." But Scott's view was that "an author might be satisfied if he got one-sixth part of the retail price of his book for his share of the profits." There are contemporary novelists who, if offered this share, would certainly follow the precedent set by Oliver Twist.

— PENGUIN.

Reviews.

AN INDIAN TALE.

"The Livery of Eve." Translated from the original Manuscript. By F. W. BAIN. (Methuen. 3s. 6d. net.

It is surely time that Mr. Bain ceased trying to delude us by the pretence that his books are translations from Hindu manuscripts. It is sixteen years since he began to set that cunning snare with "A Digit of the Moon." He tried it on us in "The Ashes of a God," and in "A Syrup of the Bees," and now in "The Livery of Eve," he tries it again. Less wily he must be than the alluring spirits in whom he loves to concentrate his conception of eternal woman. For none of those guileful spirits, we think, would try the same snare twice, least of all if the first time failed. And we all know now what to look for in these beautiful and enticing volumes as they appear. We know that they are not the translations of a manuscript, but the translations of a soul—the soul of a people.

It is a soul very difficult for the British mind to understand, or even to imagine. In the preface to "The Ashes of a God," the author, looking west to Lundy Island down the Bristol Channel, calls thus to India's Maheshwara:—

"O, Wearer of the Moony Tire, who art thyself the Past, the Present, and the Future, didst thou, for all thy knowledge of Time's secrets, ever dream that one day thy worshippers would all fall under the direction of this misty little island in a far-off northern sea? Was it irony in the Creator, who makes and ruins even worlds in sport, to subject thy dreaming millions to the Western men of business, less like them than any people on the surface of the earth?"

It is, in fact, almost impossible for the British mind to find its way among the masses of Indian mythology. The beautiful legends of early Greece are still thought essential for our highest education, and complete ignorance of the amours of Zeus, or the labors of Hercules, still marks a man as never having been at our best schools or universities. From Grimm and Wagner most educated people have also learnt something about the Teutonic stories connected with our own early racial religion. Of recent years, Lady Gregory, Yeats, and the Irish have induced us to accept some slight acquaintance with the Celtic mythology, which is also our own, though mainly, we suppose, "on the spindle side." The religious conceptions of the early Hebrews have become so intertwined with our national thought and character, that we accept them as racial now. But very few know anything whatever about the Hindu myths. The popular mind is satisfied with the old tales of Juggernaut, self-tortured fakirs, suttee, and supposed immoral rites; while even those whose knowledge has advanced a little further, find themselves entangled in a jungle of apparently monstrous inventions and incredible deities, whose many-handed attributes melt and fade almost imperceptibly from one god or goddess to another, so that the embodiment of life is also the embodiment of death, and the goddess of fertility is worshipped with the bloody sacrifices of destruction.

Apart from the learned, probably Sister Nivedita, by her "Web of Indian Life," her "Cradle Tales of Hinduism," and other books, has done most to enlighten the English mind upon the real significance of these strange religious forms and symbols and traditions. With the passionate sympathy of understanding which characterized that fiery and devoted spirit, she has interpreted, perhaps idealized, and always sought out what is best in the Indian aspects of life and eternity, so peculiarly opposite to our own. But a high place in the same great service must also be given to Mr. Bain. If he has never come quite so close to the common daily life of Indian households as Nivedita's womanhood enabled her to come, he is far more learned. His long professorship at Poona gave him opportunities such as many Anglo-Indians possess, and he, among few, took advantage of. He is also more of an artist. Having soaked his mind in Hindu thought, he is able to express it in artistic or poetic forms which are hardly distinguishable from the Indian tales, and yet are his own. He has cultivated an English prose which sometimes in his prefaces sounds a little affected, a little precious, but in the tales

themselves is felt to be exactly the right medium for scenes and situations which are themselves exotic and a little precious. The "Arabian Nights" are all the better for being set in language rather unusual or archaic; and these Indian stories lie much further from our British art of narrative than the "Arabian Nights."

The present tale is full of marvels—breaches of those natural laws in which the Western world puts so absolute a trust. The heroine is a divine or semi-divine water-sprite, who spends most of an immortal youth playing with the fish in a lovely pool, or basking upon an emerald slab beside it, clothed in her abundant hair. Souls pass again through life in various forms, according to their behavior in a previous existence, and the poor deluded villain of the piece is a dwarf whose humped back showed he had been a cow in a former birth. A king who sees his queen talking to a man lays both before an elephant to be trampled to death (but that is a barbaric rather than miraculous treatment). We move among gods or demi-gods who can make themselves so heavy at will that no one can move them. We live in a world where it is dangerous to leave an empty body lying about—even a parrot's or a fish's—for a human soul may be forced to enter it by the recitation of a magic "jap" (pronounced "jup," and, we suppose, the same word as the "gup," or silly rumor, of our soldier language). It is a world in which subjects are very proud of their king, "thinking him another god of love, and as often as they caught sight of him going through the city on his elephant, they were as delighted as if they had suddenly obtained the fruit of their birth." It is a magic and fairy world. And yet each man and woman in it lies under the law of personality and the inevitable effects of self. "Quisque suos patimur manes," as the Roman poet said, with strange divination, of the unknown "Kharma."

"For mortals strive in vain, by no matter what exertions, to avert that fate that is indelibly dyed in their souls by the actions of a previous existence; and, like weavers, they must work out, will they will not, the web whose pattern they carry within them, resembling, as they move on, bullocks, dragged by a rope tied fast to their horns, along the road they will not go."

But more strange than the Hindu doctrine of fate, and almost as strange to the Western mind as India's multifarious and commingled deities, is the picture of women which Mr. Bain presents. It is an Oriental picture; but the race or religion which accepts Sita as the ideal of womanhood, and the story of Sita and Rama as the ideal of love, cannot really regard every woman as a guileful temptation and perilous snare. Yet that is the view which Mr. Bain has almost invariably adopted. Certainly, the conception is to be found commonly in Hindu thought; for love is the eternal enemy of that absolute mastery over self which is the ascetic ideal in India as it was in Egyptian deserts or the monasteries of Athos. One of the commonest Hindu sculptures represents the god Maheshwara reducing the god of love to ashes by one lightning glance of his third eye because love interrupted his eternal calm of contemplation. Another represents Janaka, the father of Sita above mentioned, and the only man who in this flesh attained to salvation without death: for he sat still with one hand in a blazing fire and the other upon a woman's breast, showing that to him the one was the same as the other, and both indifferent. And we poor Occidentals, so few of whom are in the least like Janaka, must remember that an asceticism, undreamt of in our philosophy, is the ultimate ideal or reward of the finest Indian nature, and that, when a Hindu man of affairs has played his part, instead of retiring to a country house with a pleasant wife and a little shooting, he hopes to don the saffron robe and dwell in mountain caverns among his brother beasts and birds, or to wander to and fro till death upon the banks of a sacred river, in which he will not even fish. To such contemplation and devoted pilgrimage the love of woman, or even the regretful memory of that love, is the greatest hindrance. "The Ashes of a God," one of the author's most beautiful tales, especially illustrates this conception of woman as the snare to the contemplative soul. In the preface we read:—

"What, then, is it that is of all things most peculiarly the object of regret; that laughs at all efforts to reduce it to oblivion and nonentity; that refuses to be driven into the *oubliettes* of any soul? Needless to say, a woman. And therefore it is that she is regarded, in Oriental mysticism, as beyond all other things the enemy of emancipation; the

THE BATTLES

of the next three months will decide the fate of Europe. We follow the progress of the campaign, so far as we can, in the daily communiqués and official reports, but it is impossible to understand the significance of its changes without an adequate knowledge of strategy.

The best guide to the proper understanding of the war is to be found in Mr. Belloc's masterly articles which appear every week in

LAND & WATER

They are the result of special and detailed study, free from sentiment and prejudice, and explain in simple terms the objects and effects of the successive operations in every theatre of war. Naval events and problems are dealt with weekly by Mr. Pollen, who, as a naval critic, stands alone.

There are always well informed articles on social and economic questions, and Mr. J. C. Squire contributes a regular review of "Life and Letters." Frequent stories by "Centurion" and a weekly cartoon by Raemaekers combine to make LAND & WATER unique in modern journalism.

EVERY THURSDAY

CONSTABLE & Co Ltd

GERMAN IMPERIALISM AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

Based upon German Authorities and the Archives of the French Government. By JACQUES MARQUIS DE DAMPIERRE. Illustrations from Facsimiles. 10s. 6d. net.

SECOND PRINTING NOW READY.

"This work is one of permanent scientific worth and deserves to be carefully studied by every thinking man."

—*International Law Notes.*

"A number of books on the mentality and methods of German warfare have already appeared, but none which is as complete and well documented as this volume by an author who is not only deeply and widely read in German political literature, but also an expert archivist and trained in the sifting of historical evidence."

—*Morning Post.*

"M. de Dampierre is serious, weighty, scholarly. He writes as one who brings to the study of contemporary history the habits formed in the great school which has grown up round the study of the French archives, and his work is as scientific, as *documenté*, as that of any German. . . It is a valuable book."

—*The Times.*

"The case against the enemy of civilization is set forth and documented with the cold precision of an advocate charged with a brief in which he has little personal interest. The result is all the more telling."

"In this very ably and temperately written book, fortified throughout by the evidence of enemy literature and documents, the French author shows how deliberately the Germans have set international law at defiance, sinning against the light."

—*Spectator.*

NOW READY.

THE EXPANSION OF EUROPE

By RAMSAY MUIR, Professor of Modern History in the University of Manchester, Author of "Nationalism and Internationalism." 6s. net.

10 Orange Street London WC 2

JOHN LANE'S SELECTED

IN GOOD COMPANY

Some personal Recollections of Swinburne, Lord Roberts, Watts-Dunton, Oscar Wilde, Edward Whymper, S. J. Stone, and Stephen Phillips. By COULSON KERNAHAN. Crown 8vo. 5s. net. [Second large Edition in the Press.

"So attractive, so pleasant—a delightful book."—*Observer.*

LIVELY RECOLLECTIONS

By CANON JOHN SHEARME. Illustrated. Crown 8vo. 5s. net. A Vicar of Ryde and a Canon of Winchester, the author, in the course of his long life, has known many eminent characters, and has good stories to tell of most of them.

"A delightful volume, radiant on every page of the author's genial nature."—*Daily Graphic.*

THE BIGAMIST

By F. E. MILLS YOUNG. 6s. [Second Edition. "The authoress is to be congratulated on a remarkably fine book."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

"A creditable piece of work."—*Nation.*

"The psychological evolution of effects is described by a masterly hand."—*Field.*

A LITTLE WORLD APART

By GEORGE STEVENSON (Author of "Topham's Folly" and "Jenny Cartwright," &c.). 6s. [Second Edition. "I say flatly and finally that 'A Little World Apart' is a masterpiece, and that George Stevenson ought to be famous before the daffodils are dead."—JAMES DOUGLAS in the *Star.*

FURTHER FOOLISHNESS

Sketches and Satires on the Follies of the Day. By STEPHEN LEACOCK, Author of "Literary Lapses," "Sunshine Sketches," &c. With Coloured Frontispiece by "Fish," and five other Illustrations by M. BLOOD. 3s. 6d. net.

"The fit and few admirers of Thomas Love Peacock used to call themselves Peacockians; but the Peacock Club has been closed, and the cult is fading away. A new cult has arisen, and it rhymes with the old one. 'Are you a Leacockian?' men say when they meet. Some day there will be a Leacock Club."—JAMES DOUGLAS in the *Star.*

THE WAR AFTER THE WAR

By ISAAC F. MARCOSSON. 5s. net.

This timely and significant book is the first authoritative interpretation of the great post-war economic problem.

"There is plenty of 'straight talk' in Mr. Marcosson's volume, but a vein of strong common-sense runs through his strictures, and there is ample evidence to prove that the author has closely studied the problems he discusses."—*Daily Telegraph.*

THE LONG SPOON

By MRS. CHARLES BRYCE (Author of "Mrs. Vanderstein's Jewels," "The Ashiel Mystery," &c.). 6s.

Mrs. Bryce has hitherto been known to the public for her detective stories, but in her new novel she takes as her motif the mysteries of necromancy.

POEMS OF BRIAN BROOKE

With a Foreword by M. P. WILLCOCKS, and nine Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.

Captain Brian Brooke (Gordon Highlanders), one of those who has given his life for his country, was by inclination, and in fact, a wanderer and a big game hunter, and his poems deal principally with life in the Wilds.

THE HAMPSTEAD MYSTERY

By WATSON and REES. 6s. [Second Edition.

"A murder mystery worked out with considerable ingenuity, and with several novelties both in incident and treatment."—*Land and Water.*

THE EAT LESS MEAT BOOK WAR RATION COOKERY

By MRS. C. S. PEEL, Director of Women's Service, Ministry of Food. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.

A book that every patriot should obtain at once.

CLOSED LIPS

By GEORGE VANE, Author of "The Lifted Latch," &c. Crown 8vo. 6s.

"Well-drawn pen pictures of Naples streets, views in Rome, and scenery, which alternate with vivid dialogue."—*National News.*

CHIN MUSIC: Dialogues of To-Day

By KEBLE HOWARD. Crown 8vo. 1s. net.

"The happy, easy humour characteristic of the writer."—*Times.*

SOME VIEWS RESPECTING A FUTURE LIFE

By SAMUEL WADDINGTON. Narrow Crown 8vo, half vellum. 3s. 6d. net.

Views of Confucius and Buddha to Maeterlinck and Sir Oliver Lodge.

JOHN LANE, The BODLEY HEAD, Vigo Street, W.

WRITE FOR SPRING LIST AND LATEST CATALOGUE.

clog par excellence; the fetter of the soul; the everlastingly regretted; the unforgettable and unforgotten; the irreducible residuum; the inextinguishable spark among the ashes of the past."

Hoping to save his son from this haunting interruption to abstracted thought, the father of the beautiful King Keshawa, in the new tale before us, employs such futile means as fathers will:—

"He collected," we are told, "as tutors for his son, from all quarters, sages and ascetics and pundits in the *shāstra* of woman, who had gone to its farther shore, and resembled a very mine of antidotes to the woman-poison. And all combining, they poured over the head of Keshawa, from his youth up, a very flood of the essence of the experiences of feminine craft till he began to resemble a garden, not only walled in and sheltered from intruders, but stored with innumerable antidotic herbs."

"Needless to say," the paternal culture of that antidotic garden was all in vain, for, as we are told, there is not in the world any longing like the longing of a woman for a man such as Keshawa was. "For the soul of every woman yearns to give itself away, only she can hardly ever find the true recipient." It is a dubious saying, reminding one of the still more dubious saying in "A Syrup of the Bees":—"For just as every male lover loves to play the tyrant, so does every woman love to play the slave, so much that unless her love contains for her the consciousness of slavery, it is less than nothing in her own eyes, and she does not love at all." With which sentiment, so repellent to the free-born Western mind, we will close. For as to the water-sprite in search for her true recipient, and her guiles and wiles and transformation of various souls, are they not written in the book of "The Livery of Eve"? Which livery is the red—the crimson of the evening sky.

A FORERUNNER OF THE NEW BIOLOGY.

"An Introduction to a Biology, and Other Papers." By A. D. DARBISHIRE. (Cassell. 7s. 6d. net.)

THIS book is another of those melancholy memorials, made common by the war, which stand in every field of endeavor, as sad and painful of contemplation as are their symbolical counterparts, the broken columns and truncated obelisks of the burying-ground.

The unfinished essay which forms the volume's backbone is, in point of fact, little else than a combination of the biological doctrines of Butler and of Bergson—held together and modified by the activity of a fresh and independent thought. It would be as easy for an old-fashioned zoologist to pull it unsparingly to pieces, as for a Lamarckian or a Bergsonian to praise its tendency and its reasoning. But for one who attempts to see beyond the partizanship of creeds and movements, either course would be equally futile. To him the book becomes the record of an independent mind, finding itself through revolt against an orthodoxy that is no longer adequate: of a biologist trained in an old-fashioned school, learning to think for himself, picking and testing his intellectual weapons. It will be valuable in itself. Its sincerity compels, its vigor and humor attract attention; while its arguments will provoke much-needed thinking. But to those who can judge contemporary thought, and, above all, to those who were privileged to know its author, it will remain the broken obelisk, the bitter memorial, not of the past, but of what could and would have been.

The first chapter will bear us out. It contains little that is strictly biological, more than half being taken up with discussions (very sound and stimulating) of the relations between description and interpretation; of the definition of "Natural Laws"; and the divergence between words and their meanings. The thought is always fresh, the writing good. What could be more vivid than this (p. 21):—"A word and its meaning, especially in the case of ideas . . . are united together by a slender, elastic bond which is now contracted, now stretched to its uttermost. . . . We see the word and its meaning dancing to each other in an airy medium, like a pair of gnats in the lee of a gorse-bush"? Or more stimulating than this (p. 36):—"An acceptable theory is more likely to be one which resembles the mind, than one which resembles the phenomenon (pro-

vided that the phenomenon is not also a product of a mind, such as a murder or a machine)?"

But what is he *doing*? For the most part he is accomplishing that hard and thankless task, the achievement of intellectual maturity. He is finding out that language is inadequate to deal with shifting concepts, or that when we speak of a Law of Nature we are only using a convenient, if misleading, phrase instead of a cumbersome string of words (which, as he would himself be the first to acknowledge, would quickly become conventionalized and unmeaning in its turn). The ground must be cleared in this way for each independent attack of thought; but to do so is not in itself biology—it is not even an introduction to biology; it is the introduction to that Introduction.

There is, however, in this first chapter one broad and sweeping assertion which gives us the key to the composition of the whole essay, and, coming from any biological specialist, is an utterance of importance. Let him speak for himself:—"No biology can lay claim to completeness which leaves out of account such essential manifestations of life as human invention, self-expression through painting, poetry, or music, activities and aspirations which constitute the very life which each one of us leads."

This claim, we believe, characterizes a far larger number of biologists than Darbishire himself believed. They are, for the most part, inarticulate and unorganized as yet: he was one of the first to speak out. To him be the credit he deserves; for to speak out is to hasten fruition. He and they do not claim that, since man is part of the subject-matter of biology, all human activities should be turned over to the biologist for study and appraisal. But they see that the time has come when pure science and the current thinking of society alike will profit by the establishment of a department of knowledge—call it biology if you will—that shall insist upon examining the facts of human life side by side with the facts of the lives of other organisms, and from a single standpoint. Furthermore, they insist upon Mind being allotted its proper place in the biological scheme. In so doing, they reveal the origin of their protest; for it originated, in Darbishire's own case for example, in the passionate knowledge that he, an organism, had as main-spring of all the important activities of his life a set of purely mental processes—love of truth, desire for self-expression, devotion to music, humor. It is as a pioneer of that new Naturalism which will come to dominate the twentieth century's thought that he should in truth be read.

The second chapter is concerned mainly with developing that idea of Samuel Butler's, that the invention of tools and machines, Man's greatest single achievement, is best looked upon by the biologist as the development of a potentially infinite number of detachable limbs. It is one of those wide-ranging conceptions, obvious or startling, according to circumstances, which are of great value for giving a point of view, but for that alone. The truth is that Butler's "Life and Habit" chanced to be the talisman which opened Darbishire's eyes as he was struggling with the morphologically-minded formulæ pumped into him at Oxford. He himself says (p. 115):—"The change wrought in us by reading 'Life and Habit' was miraculous. An extraordinary change had also come over the living things we saw. . . . They were alive. Evolution from that time became a thing in which it was not a necessity, but a joy, to believe." He had not come to realize that a talisman may avail to open the eyes of intellect, and yet not be the Philosopher's Stone; and Butler's doctrines are still treated by him rather as things sacred in themselves, a devotion which has now and then perverted even so common-sense a mind into making such meaningless statements as this (taken direct from Butler), that the offspring is *personally identical* with any or all of its ancestors.

The remainder of the first two chapters is devoted to an admirable employment of one of Bergson's most illuminating views—that the intellect is a specially-evolved *form* of mind, a mental organ as closely adapted to the handling of matter as is the eye to the perception of sunlight.

Chapter III. is a protest against conceiving of the organism as a machine, and against the notion that "the materialistic conception of Natural Selection" is in any sense an explanation of Evolution. He is perhaps not always quite clear as to the distinction between *materialistic* and the broad sense of *mechanistic*; and surely nobody but a few

Mr. Murray's New Books

Mr. Murray's Lists of New Books
will be posted regularly on request

By WILLIAM WATSON

THE MAN WHO SAW

AND OTHER POEMS ARISING OUT OF THE WAR. This new book includes about fifty poems in a great variety of keys, but all inspired by an impassioned, if not an always too sanguine, patriotism. The volume is one of Mr. Watson's strongest, and, as a kind of lyrical commentary on the war, is likely to take a very individual place 3/6 net

ARTHUR JOHN BUTLER

A MEMOIR, by Sir ARTHUR QUILLER-ROUCH, of the accomplished scholar who, from 1898 until his death in 1910, was Professor of Italian language and literature at University College, London 7/6 net

REMINISCENCES OF A LITERARY LIFE

By CHARLES MacFARLANE, Author and Traveller (1799-1858). With an Introduction by John F. Tattersall. "We would not have missed such a book, as the vulgar exaggeration goes, for worlds. Not one book of reminiscences in fifty is as good."—*The Nation* 10/6 net

AN ADMIRAL'S WIFE IN THE MAKING

By LADY POORE, author of "Recollections of an Admiral's Wife." "A most entertaining collection of breezy reminiscences of life ashore, and on the ocean wave."—*Punch* 7/6 net

EIDOLA. Poems

By FREDERIC MANNING. "Mr. Manning has been known to lovers of good literature for the fastidious scholarship of his work both in poetry and in prose. In his new volume . . . the poet shows us a new face of the many-faced God of War."—*The Spectator* 2/6 net

JAN AND HER JOB

By Mrs. L. ALLEN HARKER, author of "Miss Esperance and Mr. Wycherly," etc. "Of the fun and the charm of small children nobody can tell a better tale than Mrs. Allen Harker . . . you will not easily find a book which gives more rest and refreshment."—*Daily Telegraph* 5/- net

KIT

By KATHARINE TYNAN. "What is it that makes a new book by Miss Katharine Tynan affect the reader like a holiday in the country? For after reading 'Kit' one feels that life in war time is well worth living."—*Liverpool Post* 6/-

A REGIMENTAL SURGEON

IN WAR AND PRISON. By Captain R. V. DOLBEY, M.B., M.S., R.A.M.C. A doctor's vivid picture of the firing line in France during the early days of the war, and of life in four German Prisoners of War Camps 5/- net

THE AWAKENING OF AN EMPIRE

By ROBERT GRANT WEBSTER. "A notable contribution to the study of economics, and richer in practical suggestion than any recent work of its type."—*Daily Graphic* 6/- net

London: JOHN MURRAY, Albemarle St., W. 1



"During the two years I spent at York I learnt more than in any two years of my life."—JOHN BRIGHT.

THE MAKING OF SUCCESSFUL MEN.

CHARACTER BUILDING has always been the chief educational aim of those responsible for the curriculum at Bootham School, York, and men of high rank in our National and Civic life have gladly acknowledged the advantages which they have derived from their association with this Progressive School.

With firm faith in the importance of "many sidedness of interest," "Bootham" provides a broad and varied course of study, and aims at making the most and best of each pupil. Thus a due sense of responsibility and self-control is developed, and this in turn promotes an atmosphere of good fellowship and mutual helpfulness.

Parents who have boys ready for school are invited to send for "The Bootham Illustrated Year Book," which contains some addresses by Old Bootham Scholars, and special articles by Members of the Staff. A copy of this interesting brochure and the new Prospectus can be had on application to the Secretary to Governors, Bootham School, York.

Note.—Bootham School was founded in order to give a good religious and literary education, and careful moral training to the sons of Members of the Society of Friends, but the School gladly admits, at the discretion of the Headmaster, other boys who are likely to appreciate and profit by this type of education, whose parents are willing that they shall fall in with the ordinary regulations of the School.

evolution-mongers of the last century really believed that natural selection was more than half the explanation of evolution. It is the explanation of Adaptation, of the fitting of Life to Matter.

And Darbishire, the Bergsonian, had not seen that Bergson's terms are mostly not explanations, but rather the most brilliant condensations of imagination—synthetic descriptions, like "God" or "love," which enable us to handle whole realms of meaning with no more immediate exertion than that needed to pick up a single word. Darbishire, for example, would believe the *dan vital* to be an essential reality, of the nature of Will. Is it not rather a label for that fundamental fact of life, its tendency to pullulate and shoot out in all directions, which is the combined resultant of Metabolism—the one distinctive character of living matter—and of Variation, that still unsolved problem which, though no reader of this book would have guessed it, was put by Darwin himself in the forefront of his theories?

The fourth, that was to have been the constructive chapter, was not yet written when Darbishire joined the Army—only to succumb to an attack of spotted fever.

Darbishire was one of those who deliberately preferred independence of thought to much reading. In a review (p. 117) he says:—"The notion that the truth must be sought in books is still widely prevalent, and the present dearth of illiterate men constitutes a serious menace to the advancement of knowledge." It is perhaps a pity he had not read more in other biological fields. If he had known his William James, with, say, Washburn's "Animal Mind" and McDougall's "Social Psychology," or been familiar with such developments of modern physiology as Haldane's work on respiration, or, still more, Cannon's on the emotions, much of his protest could never have taken the shape it has.

As it is, one cannot close the book without a sigh. Why was that keen mind not spared to take the final step? His instinctive impatience with materialism drove him to pick up the first stick he could find with which to belabor the ideas he hated. That stick was a semi-mystical vitalism; and among the doctrines he struck at were many that, could he have seen them in their true perspective, were harmless enough.

An American zoologist has put the new biology in a nutshell with his dictum that if Science had but made her discoveries in the organic realm first, before those in the inorganic, we should to-day have a larger and a truer conception of Matter, for our conception would include Mind.* In such a synthetic view could most of the doubts and controversies of this book have been resolved. Yet it was well worth writing. It is a gallant attempt to enunciate a theory of life; and we cannot close more fittingly than by quoting, with the fullest approval, his own words on that subject:—"A flaw in the construction of an aeroplane may endanger the life of one man; . . . but a flaw in our conception of life may endanger the whole of humanity, and condemn it to an existence from which the sudden end of the airman would be a merciful deliverance."

JULIAN HUXLEY.

CARVING UP TURKEY.

"Turkey and the War." By VLADIMIR JABOTINSKY. (Fisher Unwin. 6s. net.)

M. JABOTINSKY in this book asks and answers a question: "What is to be done with the Turk and his Empire?" The author has knowledge and experience of Turkey and the East, a mind which prefers to travel along a road composed of its own, rather than other people's thoughts, and a lively style; what he writes should, therefore, be read by everyone who realizes the importance of the settlement of the Near East for the international future. Whatever the school of political and international thought to which the reader inclines, he will have the stimulus, we can safely prophesy, of sometimes most violently disagreeing with the author. For M. Jabotinsky has drunk in his political doctrines from an undiluted well of Realpolitik and Imperialism, and yet, unlike other Imperialists, he preaches the necessity of satis-

fying the Imperialistic impulses and desires of everyone, Ally and foe alike, Russian, Briton, Frenchman, and German.

He starts from the thesis that the Ottoman Empire must be destroyed. "It is a painful duty to insist," he says, "upon the destruction of a living body. It is especially painful for a writer who knows the people he dooms to death." Now there are few people who would not agree that some drastic change is required in the administration of the territory now subject to Constantinople. Sir Edwin Pears has described the Turk in his private life as simple, kindly, and generous, and M. Jabotinsky's experience endorses the accuracy of the description. But it is difficult to find anything good to say for the Turk as a ruler; the best that can be said for him is that he is politically incompetent, that he cannot rise above the level of a conqueror, and that his Empire rests upon a vacillating basis of despotism, self-government, anarchy, corruption, and massacre. While that system continues, there can be for Europe no certainty of peace or stability in international relations. It is, therefore, possible to agree with M. Jabotinsky when he argues that the Sick Man is so sick that the Great Powers must be bold and resolute surgeons, and not spare the knife. But M. Jabotinsky is not content with prescribing that the surgeons shall kill their patient; he argues vehemently that surgery must be followed by cannibalism, and that the surgeons must be encouraged, or allowed, to swallow the amputated limbs. Thus Russia, we learn, demands, and must be given, possession of Constantinople and the Straits, the Gallipoli peninsula and the Asiatic coast of the Dardanelles, and the whole of Armenia. Britain, we learn, has already arranged with France the partition of Syria and Mesopotamia, so that the former will swallow the Holy Land and the Garden of Eden, and the latter the whole of the northern portion of Syria. Italy and Greece are to have a few minor pickings, and Germany is to be given a kind of economic protectorate over the dismembered trunk of the Ottoman Empire, which, by that time, will have dwindled to Anatolia.

Such is M. Jabotinsky's scheme in outline for the partition of Turkey. It is, he argues, the main object of the war, just as Mesopotamia, Palestine, Armenia, and the Balkans really are its main front. He attempts to support this paradox with considerable skill and much interesting knowledge; but his whole outlook is vitiated by one of those intellectual squints which are characteristic of the thorough-going Imperialist. At the beginning of the book he rapidly surveys what he calls our "alleged aims of the war," the freedom of small nationalities, the destruction of militarism, &c., and he dismisses them all as secondary to the "claims" of the various nations to the different limbs of a carved-up Turkey. These "alleged aims" are all, he argues, merely ideals, whereas the "claims," the rights of Russia, France, Britain, and Germany to expand at the expense of Turkey are facts and realities. He even refuses to discuss the validity of the several claims—the knowledge that Great Britain claims Palestine is, for him, sufficient to make it "a reality." M. Jabotinsky has fallen into the common Imperialist fallacy of not seeing that an Imperialist ideal is no less an ideal and no more "a reality" than any other ideal. "Expansion" and "the partition of Turkey" are ideals no less than the limitation of armaments or internationalism. "We are dealing" in this war, he repeats more than once, "with plain realities, not with ideals." He admits that, for instance, the determination to acquire Palestine for the British Empire is confined to a small circle in this country. He does not explain why this ideal of a few persons who gather together in newspaper offices or Government offices is a "plain reality," while that term is denied to the ideals of the thousands who joined the New Armies, the ideals of a new and a better international system. That new international system would imply the substitution of international co-operation for the old game of national grab. It would imply, for example, the application of international government to the Straits and Constantinople—a suggestion briefly dismissed by M. Jabotinsky as an ideal—and the building up and consolidation of a national administration, or administrations, in the other parts of the Ottoman Empire under international guidance and guarantee.

* G. H. Parker, in his "Biology and Social Problems."



DO YOU WANT A LORRY?

—We can give early
delivery of one of the
famous AUSTIN 2-3
tonners
It embodies 35 war-
service improvements

Full specification sent at request—

Chassis - - £695

Write to-day to

The Austin Motor Co Ltd.

Head Office and Works

Northfield Birmingham

London - Paris - Manchester - Norwich

THE YOKOHAMA SPECIE BANK LIMITED.

HEAD OFFICE: YOKOHAMA. LONDON OFFICE: 7, BISHOPSGATE, E.C.

CAPITAL SUBSCRIBED ... Yen 48,000,000

CAPITAL PAID UP Yen 30,000,000 | RESERVE FUND Yen 21,300,000

The Seventy-fourth Half-Yearly General Meeting of Shareholders was held at the Head Office, Yokohama, on the 10th March, 1917, when the Directors submitted the following statement of the Liabilities and Assets of the Bank, and the Profit and Loss Account, for the half-year ended 31st December, 1916, which was duly approved.

BALANCE SHEET.

LIABILITIES.		Y.
Capital (paid up)	30,000,000.00	
Reserve Fund	20,800,000.00	
Reserve for Doubtful Debts	2,312,072.74	
Notes in Circulation	18,050,547.02	
Deposits (Current, Fixed, &c.)	274,778,798.77	
Bills Payable, Bills Re-discounted, Acceptances, and other sums due by the Bank	226,851,118.14	
Dividends Unclaimed	8,903.77	
Balance of Profit and Loss brought forward from last Account	1,437,455.74	
Net Profit for the past Half-year	2,582,400.58	
	Yen 576,821,296.76	

ASSETS.

	Y.	Y.
Cash Account—		
In Hand	30,710,065.68	
At Bankers	35,742,686.43	67,452,752.11
Investments in Public Securities		21,530,171.45
Bills discounted, Loans, Advances, &c.		178,632,839.85
Bills receivable and other sums due to the Bank		303,017,424.96
Gold and Foreign Money		2,264,209.96
Bank's Premises, Properties, Furniture, &c.		3,923,898.43
	Yen 576,821,296.76	

PROFIT AND LOSS ACCOUNT.

	Y.
To Interests, Taxes, Current Expenses, Rebate on Bills Current, Bad and Doubtful Debts, Bonus for Officers and Clerks, &c.	27,657,512.59
To Reserve Fund	500,000.00
To Dividend—	
{ yen 6.00 per Old Share for 240,000 Shares }	1,800,000.00
{ yen 1.50 per New Share " " " }	1,719,856.32
To Balance carried forward to next Account	Yen 31,677,368.91
	Y.
By Balance brought forward 30th June, 1916	1,437,455.74
By Amount of Gross Profits for the Half-year ending 31st December, 1916	30,239,913.17
	Yen 31,677,368.91



SERMAIZE—Unloading Hospital Sections, Aug., 1915.

THE SOCIETY of FRIENDS

in carrying on its work of RELIEF of the SUFFERING VICTIMS of the WAR has raised ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY THOUSAND POUNDS for its maintenance. It is carried on by some 170 Representatives in a large number of Relief Centres in FRANCE, in HOLLAND, and in the GOVERNMENT of SAMARA in distant RUSSIA.

The expenditure is now about £1,000 a week, and it asks for financial support from the general public.

We are giving Medical and Nursing Help in a considerable number of our Stations, accompanied by the provision of shelter for the Homeless, clothing and household requisites in the new wood huts we are building in France, the timber for which is provided by the FRENCH GOVERNMENT.

We are supplying help to restart the Farming Industry with necessary seeds and farming implements in localities devastated by battle, where farms have been utterly destroyed.

In Holland we have provided shelter and help in a variety of ways, as well as occupation for the refugees from Belgium, who are located there.

In Russia we have established Relief Centres, where clothing and other necessities are distributed, and where industries, including spinning, weaving, and knitting are organised for the benefit of the destitute people who have no one else to help them.

WE ASK THE FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF THE PUBLIC IN THIS WORK OF CHRISTIAN BENEVOLENCE

Contributions may be sent to Miss A. RUTH FRY, the Honorary Secretary to the War Victims Relief Committee at the office at

Ethelburga House, 91, Bishopsgate, London, E.C.,

who will gladly furnish any further information that may be desired.

A LOT.

"The Happy Garret." By V. GOLDIE. (Heinemann. 5s. net.)

"Hayle." By OXFORD SOMERSET. (Mills & Boon. 6s.)

"A Girl of Thanet." By MARCUS REED. (Melrose. 5s. net.)

"It was he (an editor) who suggested, one evening after a long consultation between the three of us, that I should put down my recollections, up to my present age (20!) and try to find a publisher for them." And of course Miss Hebe Hill did find a publisher for them. Who could possibly conceive a modern realist (fortified with large doses of the Café Royal) without one? Sooner would the stars . . . Hebe is an extremely ill-natured, pleasure-loving and self-satisfied young woman, with a taste for smart repartee. After her father's death, and a playful adventure with young Master Alban Rhodes, she comes to London with two thousand pounds in the bank, and a disposition to "go on the bust." Her diversions, however, are neither so original nor entertaining as we had hoped; they consist, in fact, of drifting about in the "café" and hurly-burling in a night club on almost every night in the week up to three and four in the morning. Hebe has a sharp tongue, and is clever enough to keep us turning the pages fairly slowly. But as racketing in night clubs in the company of a rather disagreeable young idler is hardly the most engaging of amusements for the spectator, we are before the end as tired of Hebe as her lover Alban (who perfidiously deserts her, and for whom, in spite of the moral reprobation we are made to feel for him, we cannot help a certain sneaking regard). So Hebe staves off boredom by philandering with a middle-aged lawyer with a respectable family, and when he has lost his wife and children through her agency, righteously repudiating him, Hebe, with an effrontery we must almost admire, takes to the pen. And we, with a passing wonder at the conceptions some people have of enjoying themselves, and a more than wonder that they desire to put them on record—to the next novel.

"Hayle" is of the good old sentimental type, which, in 1900, would probably have managed to *épater les bourgeois*. Hayle himself is a boyish, hearty, and chivalrous clergyman, who does his utmost to avoid falling in love with the fascinating Mrs. St. Clair. "Mrs." is only a title of convenience, for she has been seduced by and is living with an amiable and urbane lawyer, Marasson. Hayle dashes into his office one morning and, in true romantic fashion, insists on his marrying her. But Marasson, who is really a very agreeable character and (thanks to Mr. Somerset's good sense) not at all villainous, will have none of it, and finally gives his mistress up to Hayle with all the grace in the world. There the book should have come to an end with the marriage of the pair; but Mrs. St. Clair insists upon Hayle living with her for a year before marriage, in order, as she naively explains, to bring him down to her level and prevent him throwing, after the protracted habit of marriage, the past in her teeth. Hayle has the intelligence and common sense to have nothing to do with such a fantastic notion, and (after a course of mutual and unnecessary misery and cross-purposes) persuades her to marry him and have done with it. It is a readable and good-hearted enough novel, if taken sparingly, and we certainly prefer Mr. Somerset's sentiment to Miss Hebe Hill's contempt of it.

The "Girl of Thanet" is in a very unfortunate position indeed. She marries a man who has two other wives in existence. When the natural discomfort caused by such a past imbroglio is accentuated by the fact that the English law does not look too favorably upon polygamy, and that one of the wives is a South African "Diamond Queen," and the other a drunkard, we cannot be too surprised or concerned that Mr. Reid has seen fit to discard both the happy ending and novelistic good form at one and the same time.

The Week in the City.

PREVIOUS to Wednesday's Budget, there was not much to record on the Stock Exchange or the Money Market. The arrangements with America cannot be expected to be

completed very rapidly, for Allied finance has become a highly-complicated matter, and Congress is a more difficult body to deal with than the House of Commons. It is, perhaps, fortunate for the people of the United States that public finance cannot be shrouded in mystery, and the loans to the Allies will have to be specified without regard to the susceptibilities of the recipients. Nor will Congress allow itself to be put off with dummy estimates. Mr. Bonar Law's Budget speech on Wednesday was a relief to income-tax payers, who had feared another addition. But, in view of the enormous rate of expenditure and the staggering dimensions of the National Debt, Mr. Bonar Law's proposals cannot be thought adequate on the assumption that the war is to continue for another financial year. Industrial and shipping shares are, of course, unfavorably affected by his additions to excess profits duty and his special discrimination against shipowners' profits. The additions to tobacco duties had been anticipated by the Northcliffe Press. They will bear hardly on the working class smoker, and are likely to diminish consumption substantially. The addition to the Entertainments' Tax seems to be generally acceptable, and Free Traders will rejoice that no protective duties figure in the Budget.

THE RAND MINES REPORTS.

The reports issued by Rand Mines Ltd. show that the operations of the eight companies comprising the group were not equally successful, five of them recording lower profits. In most cases, there has been an increase in the ratio of expenses to receipts. The following table compares the results for 1916 with those of 1915:—

	1915.			1916.		
	Revenue	Costs	Profit.	Revenue	Costs	Profit.
	per ton.	per ton.	£	per ton.	per ton.	£
City Deep...	38/7	20/5	621,108	39/7	20/2	704,390
Crown Mines ...	25/4	16/2	1,146,552	25/6	18/4	815,630
Durban R. Deep ...	26/7	23/4	52,051	25/11	23/4	40,833
Goldenhuis Deep ...	25/6	21/6	128,601	25/5	20/7	169,478
Modderfontein B. ...	40/6	15/10	629,916	43/2	17/10	687,290
Robinson Gold...	27/10	13/7	492,232	24/6	13/10	367,152
Rose Deep ...	24/-	16/11	278,303	22/11	17/3	222,922
Village Deep ...	28/6	19/-	295,828	29/6	21/-	266,713

Several of the companies achieved records as regards tonnage milled, and the ore reserves of the City Deep, Crown Mines, and Modderfontein B. show a very substantial increase. The Goldenhuis Deep is the only mine in the group to show any considerable reduction in the expense ratio, and, as a considerably larger tonnage was milled, higher profits enabled the dividend to be raised. Modderfontein B. increased its output and obtained a higher yield, thus off-setting the increase in costs. The Robinson Deep, whose life is running out, produced a smaller tonnage, but the quantity milled, namely, 690,300 tons, constitutes a record in the mine's history. The results both of the Rose and Village Deeps compare unfavorably with those of 1915.

ANGLO-MALAY RUBBER.

A satisfactory report is issued by the directors of the Anglo-Malay Rubber Co. for the year 1916. The crop harvested amounted to 1,762,430 lbs., as against an estimate of 1,500,000 lbs., and a yield in 1915 of 1,543,697 lbs. The average price realized was 2s. 5.47d., as compared with 2s. 5.40d. in 1915, the "all in" cost, London, including war risk insurance, amounting to 11.23d. per lb., as against 11d. in 1915, and 1s. 0.67d. in 1914. Net profits totalled £139,869, as compared with 121,224 in 1915, out of which a dividend of 85 per cent. is paid, amounting to £127,500. A sum of £5,865 is written off capital expenditure, increasing the amount so applied to date to £178,863, or £40 7s. 6d. per acre. After making these appropriations, the balance carried forward is increased by £6,504. The current year's crop is estimated at 1,720,000 lbs.

LUCCELLUM.

A BRITISH CHARITY WHICH NEEDS HELP**The National Refuges and Training Ships 'Arethusa' and 'Chichester'**

2,400 BOYS HAVE JOINED THE ROYAL NAVY. OLD BOYS ARE SERVING IN 100 BRITISH REGIMENTS

Funds are Urgently Needed

THE WAR HAS MEANT GREATLY INCREASED EXPENSES

PATRONS: THE KING AND QUEEN.

CHAIRMAN AND TREASURER: W. E. HUBBARD, Esq.,

17, ST. HELEN'S PLACE, LONDON, E.C.

JOINT SECRETARIES: H. BRISTOW WALLEN, E. G. COPELAND.
LONDON OFFICE: 164, SHAFTESBURY AVENUE, LONDON, W.C.**BIBLES AND
PRAYER BOOKS
For PRIZES, &c.****The London Bible Warehouse,
22, Paternoster Row, E.C.,**Have the Largest and best Selection in London.
We specialise in Bibles, Prayer Books, Church
Services, etc., for Clergy, Congregation, and the
Children.

Please write, 'phone, or call. List sent post free

TELEPHONE: CENTRAL 320

THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW

MAY, 1917.

Price 2s. 6d.

THE REPORT OF LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH'S COM-
MITTEE. By EARL BEAUCHAMP, K.G.

SOME IMPRESSIONS OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION.

By SIR PAUL VINOGRADOFF.

AMERICA THEN AND NOW: RECOLLECTIONS OF LINCOLN.

By LADY MACDONELL.

THE REPORT OF THE AGRICULTURAL POLICY SUB-COM-
MITTEE OF THE RECONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE.

By THE RIGHT HON. F. D. ACLAND, M.P.

THE ROOT FAULT IN THE ENGLISH ATTITUDE TO EDUCA-
TION.

By RONALD M. BURROWS, D.Litt.

ULSTER HOME RULE: A PROPOSAL.

By ALFRED PERCEVAL GRAVES.

THE BRITISH REVOLUTION.

By HAROLD SPENDER.

PARLIAMENT DURING THE WAR.

By THE RIGHT HON. THOMAS LOUGH, M.P.

THE PROSPECT IN POLAND: I.

By O. DE L.

WAR, RELIGION, AND THE MAN IN THE STREET.

By THE RIGHT HON. SIR JOSEPH COMPTON-RICKETT, M.P.

THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE TRENCHES. By S. STAPLETON.

THE VOICE FROM THE MIZZEN MAST.

By J. E. G. DE MONTMORENCY.

**Famine in the
HOLY LAND**

The rapid development of events in the Holy Land is in a remarkable manner opening up a way for the work of the Syria and Palestine Relief Fund. The recent victory near Gaza means that we shall be able almost immediately to follow the Allied advance with FOOD, MEDICINE and CLOTHING to relieve the terrible distress of the inhabitants who are in the last stage of destitution through the cruelties and privations which they have suffered.

**MISSIONARY SOCIETIES OF
ALL DENOMINATIONS**

have united to carry out this great work. A strong administrative Committee is at work, plans for relief are already made, and goods are stored in Egypt ready to be poured into the country by sea or rail. The Fund will be economically administered by those who know the country and people best, and relief will be given to all—Christians, Jews and Arabs alike—according to their need. To meet immediate requirements, the sum of at least

£50,000 is needed at once

Please send your donation NOW to the Hon. Secretary, Syria and Palestine Relief Fund, 110, Victoria St., Westminster, S.W. 1

LAMPART & HOLT LTD.

THE fifth ordinary general meeting of this company was held on the 27th ult., at the office, 36, Lime Street, E.C., Sir Owen Phillips, K.C.M.G., M.P. (Chairman of the Company) presiding.

In moving the adoption of the Report and Accounts, the Chairman said he was pleased to say that the profits of the business for the year 1916 showed an improvement over those for the previous year, and, after still further strengthening the company's position by additions to the reserve and insurance funds, they were able to recommend a dividend of 10 per cent., being at the same rate as for 1915. The policy of the board ever since the business was incorporated as a company had been steadily to meet the requirements of the various trades in which their vessels were engaged and to make adequate provision for expansion. This policy had been pursued during two and three-quarters years of war, notwithstanding the heavily enhanced cost involved in the completion of new tonnage. As a result, in spite of their war losses, which had been by no means inconsiderable, their gross registered tonnage was actually greater by 10,000 tons than it was on August 4th, 1914. This was a result of which the board felt justly proud. In pursuance of the new policy of the Government in regard to shipping, practically the whole of their fleet not already in the service of Government for war purposes was now requisitioned by the Ministry of Shipping. The Government paid the Blue Book rates for the hire of the vessels, all earnings being for Government account, although they continued to run and manage them to the best advantage as in the past. The board loyally accepted the decision of the Government in the matter and was wholeheartedly co-operating with the new Ministry of Shipping, with a view to securing, at this critical stage of the war, the utmost national benefit by placing all their resources entirely at the service of the State. At the same time the problems of the future must not be lost sight of if the British mercantile marine was to hold his own hereafter. Bearing in mind the vitally essential national character of the services of the British mercantile marine whether in war or peace, and what the Governments of other countries—friendly and the reverse—were doing, or proposed to do, to foster their respective merchant navies, he trusted our own Government would be wideawake to the new conditions likely to arise, and would see to it that British shipping should not be unfairly handicapped in the fierce competition which would ensue with the State-aided merchant fleets of our present enemies, of neutrals, or even those of our Allies.

Referring to the recent rumours of the nationalization of British shipping, the Chairman stated that if such a policy were seriously to be entertained there would be grave danger of our losing our premier position in the shipping world.

**DON'T SELL YOUR
VICTORY LOAN.**

Write at once to The Prudential Assurance Co.,
142, Holborn Bars, E.C. 1, or to any of its Agents.

**FURNITURE for
Cash**

The best Stock of Furniture in London
at LOWEST PRICES
for Excellence of Quality and Design.

Wm. SPRIGGS & CO. Ltd. 238-241 Tottenham Court Rd W

The influence of "The Nation"

Speaking in the House of Commons on Tuesday,
April 17th,

COMMANDER J. WEDGWOOD, D.S.O., M.P., said:—

"When I was in the United States recently, I had a conversation with Colonel House, who said that the papers which he read as representing opinion in this country were THE MANCHESTER GUARDIAN and THE NATION. . . . Everybody in America seems to read THE NATION."

MR. EDWARD G. HEMMERDE, K.C., M.P., said:—

"Here is a paper which you find in the hands of every thinking man who understands English at all in Petrograd. I am not speaking only of civilians, but also of soldiers and admirals, who are far more democratic than the soldiers and admirals in this country."

EDUCATIONAL.

Leighton Park School

READING

Spacious finely timbered grounds
 Splendid new buildings
 Full staff of university men
 Excellent results in work and play
 Elaborate prospectus on application to
 The Headmaster

CROHAM HURST SCHOOL, near South Croydon.

House built for the purpose in healthy and beautiful situation. Aim of education to cultivate wide interests and intelligent habits of work. Special encouragement given to leisure pursuits and individual reading. Hockey, Tennis, Swimming, Riding.

Pupils prepared for University.

Full domestic course for senior pupils and external students.
 Principals—Miss Theodora E. Clark and Miss K. M. Ellis.

PINEHURST, CROWBOROUGH (SUSSEX).

Country School for Girls.

House in grounds on edge of Moorland, between 600 and 700 feet above sea level.

Principal, Miss H. T. NEILD, M.A. (Vict.), Class. Tripos (Camb.). Prospectus on application.

THE LEYS SCHOOL, CAMBRIDGE.

ENTRANCE SCHOLARSHIPS EXAMINATION,
 £75 (RESTRICTED), £80, ETC., IN JULY.

Particulars from "Public Schools Year Book" or the Bursar.

ROYAL HOLLOWAY COLLEGE.

(UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.)

ENTRANCE SCHOLARSHIPS.—Eleven Entrance Scholarships, from £50 to £80, and several Bursaries of not more than £30, tenable for three years at the College, will be awarded on the results of an Examination to be held from June 26th to June 30th, 1917. Names must be entered before May 26th, 1917.

The College prepares Women Students for London Degrees, inclusive fee, £100 a year.

For Forms of Entry and further particulars apply to the SECRETARY, Royal Holloway College, Englefield Green, Surrey.

THE HINDHEAD SCHOOL FOR GIRLS.

EDUCATION THOROUGHLY MODERN; physical training and outdoor games. Great attention is paid to healthful conditions of life. The boarding-house stands at an elevation of 800 ft.—For prospectus, address: Principal, BRACKENHURST, HINDHEAD, SURREY.

GUILDFORD, SURREY.

TORMEAD

A HIGH-CLASS SCHOOL FOR GIRLS,

Standing in Grounds of 8½ acres.

Thorough Education on modern lines.

Special attention to Physical Training and Games.

Fully qualified resident and visiting staff.

Principal—MISS BURNSIDE CLAYTON.

MISCELLANEOUS.

ARTIFICIAL TEETH (old) Bought. Up to 7s. per tooth pinned on vulcanite; 12s. on silver; 15s. on gold; £2 on platinum. Cash or offer by return. If offer not accepted parcel returned post free. Also OLD GOLD and SILVER JEWELLERY bought in any condition. SATISFACTION GUARANTEED by the reliable, genuine firm.
 —S. CANN & CO., 69a, Market Street, Manchester. Estd. 1850.

Goddard's Plate Powder

FOR CLEANING SILVER, ELECTRO-PLATE, ETC.
 Sold Everywhere, 6d., 1/-, 2/6 & 4/6.

"THE NATION," with which is incorporated "The Speaker," printed for the Proprietors by THE NATIONAL PRESS AGENCY LIMITED, Whitefriars House, London, E.C. 4, and published by THE NATION PUBLISHING COMPANY LIMITED at their Offices, 10, Adelphi Terrace, London, W.C. 2.—SATURDAY, MAY 5, 1917.

SCHOLARSHIPS.

MILL HILL SCHOOL, N.W.

Several ENTRANCE SCHOLARSHIPS will be awarded in competition at an Examination to be held on June 21st and two following days if Candidates of sufficient merit present themselves. The Governors have power to increase the Scholarships if they consider the circumstances of successful Candidates render this necessary. Applications should be made to the BURSAR.

ST. PAUL'S GIRLS' SCHOOL,

Brook Green, Hammersmith, W. 6.

The NEXT EXAMINATION for FOUNDATION SCHOLARSHIPS will take place on TUESDAY, WEDNESDAY, and THURSDAY, July 3rd, 4th, and 5th. These Scholarships exempt the Holders from payment of Tuition Fees.—Application should be made to the High Mistress, at the School. The last day for the registration of Candidates will be Monday, June 25th.

HOTELS AND HYDROS.

OPPOSITE THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

THACKERAY HOTEL

Great Russell Street, London.

NEAR THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

KINGSLEY HOTEL

Hart Street, Bloomsbury Square, London.

Passenger Lifts, Bathrooms on every Floor.
 Lounges and Spacious Dining, Drawing, Writing, Reading,
 Billiard and Smoking Rooms.

Perfect Sanitation. Fireproof Floors. Telephones. Night Porters.

Bedroom, Breakfast, Bath and Attendance,
 6/6 per night per person.

FULL TARIFF AND TESTIMONIALS ON APPLICATION.

Telegraphic Addresses { Thackeray Hotel—"Thackeray, London."
 Kingsley Hotel—"Bookcraft, London."
 Telephone { Museum—1230. (2 lines.)
 " 1232. (2 lines.)

BATH.

WALDRON'S Private Hotel, Queen's Sq. Nr. Park & Mineral Baths.

AT BOURNEMOUTH HYDRO.

IDEAL RESIDENCE. RESIDENT PHYSICIAN.
 Sun Lounge. Turkish Baths. Massage. Lift.

BOURNEMOUTH.

SILVERHOW. Boarding Est. West Cliff Gardens. From 35s. week.

THE QUEEN, Bath Road. Miss Tye.
 Central. Board and Residence, 38/6 to 3 guineas weekly.

BRIGHTON.

THE HOTEL METROPOLE. Fred. T. Pamment, Manager.

CHELTENHAM.

ELLENBOROUGH HOUSE. Private Hotel. Close to Spa and
 Concerts. Tel. 1071. Tariff. Mrs. Morrett.

LEEDS.

HOTEL METROPOLE. 3 minutes' walk from either station.

LIVERPOOL.

LAURENCE'S TEMPERANCE HOTEL. Clayton Square.

LYNTON (Devon).

ROYAL CASTLE FAMILY HOTEL. Grounds 9 acres.

OLDHAM HOUSE HYDROS. Tennis, Bowls, Baths. From 5s.

MATLOCK.

ROCKSIDE HYDRO. Turkish, Continental, and Electric Baths.

SMEDLEY'S HYDRO Establishment. Estab. 1853. H. Challand.

SILLOTH-ON-SOLWAY.

GOLF HOTEL. First-class family hotel. Garage and stabling.
 'Phone 8 Silloth. W. Dyer, Proprietor and Manager.

SOUTHPORT.

ROWNTREE'S CAFE, Lord St. Hot Lunch, A'noon Teas. Tel. 647.

WARWICK.

THE "DALE" HOTEL. Temperance. Shakespeare Country.

